SYMONDS
PENGETHLY.

THE
SANDFORD FLEMING
LIBRARY

THE

LIFE AND TIMES

OF

WILLIAM LAUD, D.D.

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

BY

JOHN PARKER LAWSON, M.A.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR C. J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD,

AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.

MDCCCXXIX.

BX
5199
L28L3
V.2

LONDON:
PRINTED BY R. GILBERT,
ST. JOHN'S-SQUARE.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER XIII.

1633.

PAGE

Scottish affairs—The Scottish Episcopal Church—Its constitution—Proved to be the National Church of Scotland—Evasive conduct of the Presbyterians—The Scottish Liturgy—Opinions of the Scottish Bishops—Conduct of Laud—Defence of his conduct—Rapacity of the Scotch Reforming noblemen—The Church-lands—The tithes—Political situation of the Scots—Visit of Charles I. to Scotland—Laud accompanies that monarch—His reception at Edinburgh—Preparations for the Coronation—Palace of Holyrood—Laud attends the Coronation—Dissatisfaction of the Scots—Character of the Presbyterian preachers—Their disgusts—Meeting of the Scottish Parliament—Laud's sermon in the Chapel Royal—Erection of the Bishopric of Edinburgh—Account of it—Progress of the King through Scotland—Journey of Laud—Preservation of the King—He leaves Scotland—His arrival at Greenwich—Political affairs of Scotland—Death of Archbishop Abbot—His character—Removal of Laud to the Primacy—Conduct of the Papists—Laud is offered a Cardinal's Hat—His refusal—His motives examined—The Church of Rome—Its corruptions—Observations..... 1—42

48868

CHAPTER XIV.

1633—1635.

PAGE

Enthronment of Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury—Remarks on his general character—Libels against him—Is elected Chancellor of the University of Dublin—His vigorous proceedings—Directions on ordinations—Revival of the Book of Sports—Remarks—William Prynne—His prosecution—Instance of his cunningness—The Archbishop's primary visitation—The Communion-table—Remarks on the Primate's conduct—Bishop Williams—Absurdity of some Puritan objections—The foreign Congregations—Laud's proceedings—History of the affair—Defence of his conduct—The London Clergy—Their situation in the reign of Charles I.—Their hardships—The Irish Church—Bishop Bedell—Correspondence between Laud and Lord Wentworth—The Archbishop's state appointments—His remarkable disinterestedness . . 42—110

CHAPTER XV.

1635—1637.

Archbishop Laud's regulation of the Cathedrals—Account of their state—Munificence of the Archbishop at Oxford—He procures the Caroline Charter—Proceedings of the Papists—Public contribution for the Palatinate—Appointment of Bishop Juxon to the Treasury—Dissatisfaction it excited—Honourable motives of the Archbishop—Character of Bishop Juxon—Claims of the Archbishop over the Universities—Disputes—The King and Court visit Oxford—Account of the entertainments

PAGE

—Prosecution of some Puritan ministers—Noble conduct of the Archbishop—State of affairs—Prosecution of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton—Notices of the two latter—History of the proceedings—Their sedition—Libels against Laud—Their sentence—Laud's speech in the Star-Chamber—Account of the punishment—Heroism of Prynne—Blasphemy of Burton ..... 110—199

CHAPTER XVI.

1637—1638.

Affairs of Scotland—The Scottish Church—Outline of its history from the Reformation—Imprudence of the Scottish Prelates—Proceedings of Laud—He corresponds with the Scottish Bishops—Injudicious publication of the Scottish Canons—The Liturgy—Fury of the Presbyterians—Their practices—The Earl of Traquair—His treachery—First reading of the Scottish Liturgy—Dreadful riot at Edinburgh—Practices of the Presbyterian leaders—Henderson, Dickson, &c.—Proceedings of the Privy Council—History of the disorders—Letters to Laud—Discussion on the Scottish Liturgy, &c.—Proved to be written by the Scottish Bishops—Observations—Proceedings of the Presbyterians—History of their crafty intrigues—Letters of the Magistrates of Edinburgh to Archbishop Laud—State of the kingdom—Riot at Glasgow—Conduct of the Presbyterian leaders—Daring riots of the Presbyterians at Edinburgh—Flight of the Scottish Privy Council—Royal Proclamations—Establishment of the Tables—Prelude to the Covenant—Its institution—Is sworn at Edinburgh—Blasphemy of the Covenanters—Remarkable anecdotes—Defeat of the Covenanters at Aberdeen—Observations ..... 199—266

CHAPTER XVII.

1638.

PAGE

The Archbishop's Diary—His cognizance of the Isles of Jersey and Guernsey—He publishes the second edition of his Conference—Libellous language of his enemies—The Archbishop converts Chillingworth—Notice of him—Vigilance of the Archbishop against Socinianism—He converts John Hales the "Ever Memorable"—Notice of him—His noble conduct—His interview with Laud—His troubles—Notice of his works—Restraint of the press—Holland—The Geneva Bible—New England—Intolerant conduct of the Sectaries there—Plans of the Archbishop—His visitation of Merton College....266—291

CHAPTER XVIII.

1638—1639.

The Scottish Covenanters—Their practices—The Marquis of Hamilton sent to Scotland—His sentiments on the state of the kingdom—Violence of the Covenanters—Arrival of Hamilton—His treatment—The castle of Edinburgh seized—Remarkable acts of violence—Letters of Hamilton to Laud—State of Scotland—Disorders in Edinburgh—Hamilton opens his commission—Demands of the Covenanters—Hamilton returns to London—Conduct of the Covenanters during his absence—His return—Noble conduct of the Glasgow Clergy—Libels of the Covenanters against the Bishops—Remarkable instance of their profane hypocrisy—Concessions of the King—Recantation of a Jesuit—The prophetess

PAGE

of the Covenanters—The Glasgow Assembly—Account of its members—Their practices—Disorders of the Assembly—Its illegal acts—Is dissolved by Hamilton—Continues to sit—Treason of the Covenanters—Flight of the Scottish prelates—Death of Archbishop Spottiswoode—His character ..... 291—329

CHAPTER XIX.

1639—1640.

Commencement of the Civil Wars by the Scots—Order of the Privy Council to the Archbishop to raise supplies—The Earl of Traquair sent to Scotland as Commissioner—Libels against Laud—His presents to the University of Oxford—His translations of the Liturgy—He induces Bishop Hall to write the treatise "Episcopacy by Divine Right"—Plan of the original MSS.—Observations of the Archbishop—Publication of the work—Analysis of it—Controversy it occasioned—Practices of the Puritans—Anecdote of the Archbishop—Meeting of the Parliament—Its dissolution—Indications of the Archbishop's ruin—The Convocation—It continues to sit—The Canons of 1640—Anxiety of the Archbishop—Remarks on the legality of the Convocation—Libels against the Archbishop—The mob attack Lambeth Palace, and St. Paul's—Their disorders—Practices of the Puritans—Renewed indications of his ruin—Death of Archbishop Neile—His character ..... 329—373

CHAPTER XX.

1640—1641.

Meeting of the Long Parliament—Proceedings of the members—Their practices against the Archbishop—Im-

PAGE

peachment of Strafford—Impeachment and flight of Lord Keeper Finch and Secretary Windebanke—Arrest of Strafford—Examination of the Archbishop—Deprivation of the Bishops—Debates on the Canons—Practices of the Scottish Presbyterians—Impeachment of the Archbishop—Speeches of various members of the Commons—Arrest of the Archbishop—Remarkable injustice of his enemies—Articles exhibited against the Archbishop—The Primate's reply—His defence—His committal to the Tower—Practices of the Puritans—Their libellous publications—Farther injustice of the Archbishop's enemies—Aspect of the times..... 373—409

CHAPTER XXI.

1641—1643.

Trial of Strafford—His execution—Conduct of the Archbishop—He resigns the Chancellorship of Oxford—Persecution of the Archbishop by the Commons—Hypocrisy of the Sectaries—They excite tumults against the Clergy—Misfortunes of the Archbishop—He is insulted in the Tower Chapel—Plunder of Lambeth Palace—Injustice of his enemies—Motions for his banishment overruled—Orders of the Commons—Imprudent conduct of the King—His mortifications—Arrival of the Scottish army—Meeting of the Westminster Assembly of Divines—Persecutions by the Covenanters—Natural intolerance of the Presbyterians—Their enmity to toleration—Their persecution of the Independents—Triumph of the Sectaries—Their hatred to the fine arts—They profane Cathedrals and Churches—Hardships of the Archbishop—Libels against him—Death of Hampden and Pym..... 409—452

CHAPTER XXII.

1643—1644.

PAGE

Conduct of William Prynne—Preparations for the Archbishop's trial—Preliminary proceedings—Flagrant injustice of the Archbishop's enemies—Commencement of the trial—The Articles of Impeachment—Defence of the Archbishop's conduct—Investigation of the Articles—The Archbishop's reply—Gross injustice of his enemies—Insolence of his judges—General history of the proceedings—The Archbishop is found guilty ..... 452—488

CHAPTER XXIII.

1644—1645.

Condemnation of the Archbishop by the Commons to die as a traitor—Reluctance of the Peers to sanction the sentence—The pardon of the King disregarded—Injustice of the sentence—Alteration of the sentence to beheading—The Archbishop prepares for death—His conduct on the night before his execution—He is led out to the scaffold—His address to the spectators—His dying discourse—His prayers on the scaffold—His devotion and magnanimity—His conduct on the scaffold—Inhuman behaviour of his enemies—His last prayer—His death—Conclusion ..... 488—512

CHAPTER XXIV.

1644—1645.

Fall of the Church—Character of Archbishop Laud—His patronage of great men—Remarks on his religious principles—His burial—His last Will—Conclusion of the History ..... 512—546

LIFE AND TIMES

OF

WILLIAM LAUD, D.D.

CHAPTER XIII.

1633.

Scottish affairs—The Scottish Episcopal Church—Its constitution—Proved to be the National Church of Scotland—Evasive conduct of the Presbyterians—The Scottish Liturgy—Opinions of the Scottish Bishops—Conduct of Laud—Defence of his conduct—Rapacity of the Scotch reforming noblemen—The Church-lands—The Tithes—Political situation of the Scots—Visit of Charles I. to Scotland—Laud accompanies that Monarch—His reception at Edinburgh—Preparations for the coronation—Palace of Holyrood—Laud attends the coronation—Dissatisfaction of the Scots—Character of the Presbyterian preachers—Their disgusts—Meeting of the Scottish Parliament—Laud's sermon in the Chapel Royal—Erection of the Bishopric of Edinburgh—Account of it—Progress of the King through Scotland—Journey of Laud—Preservation of the King—He leaves Scotland—His arrival at Greenwich—Political affairs of Scotland—Death of Archbishop Abbot—His character—Removal of Laud to the Primacy—Conduct of the Papists—Laud is offered a Cardinal's Hat—His refusal—His motives examined—The Church of Rome—Its corruptions—Observations.

THE affairs of Scotland now claim our attention, and its history from this period is most important.

Since the accession of Charles in 1625, that kingdom had been in a state of considerable tranquillity, few events of any importance having occurred, and few indications being given of that seditious spirit by which the country was afterwards destined to be agitated. The Episcopal Church, though still the object of hatred to the Presbyterians, retained its eminence; its prelates, at the head of whom was Archbishop Spottiswoode, the wise and virtuous metropolitan, were distinguished for their learning, and they were unpopular only with those nobles who disliked to be united with ecclesiastics in the administration of state affairs, because they were an obstacle to their measures for the attainment of temporal grandeur; and with those of the people, who were led by the Presbyterian preachers, who still clamoured against the Five Articles of Perth, studiously cherishing the popular prejudice against the Bishops, charging them with Popery, Arminianism, and neglect of the Sabbath. Being devoted, moreover, to the Church of England, from whom the Scottish Episcopal clergy received their ordination, they consequently were attached to the Liturgy and ritual of that Church, which attachment, in the eyes of the zealots for Presbytery, was as criminal as a regard for all the ceremonies of the Popish superstition [1].

With the exception of the Five Articles of Perth, the King's approval of them, and of the ecclesiasti-

[1] Bishop Burnet's Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, p. 29.

cal government then established [1], the Church of Scotland, though essentially as Episcopal in its constitution as that of England, had been hitherto virtually Presbyterian in its public worship [2]. The King's continental affairs had forced him to postpone the consideration of a Liturgy, and his parliamentary disputes up to this period had still farther tended to make him overlook the northern Church. The Scottish clergy, consequently, imitated the Presbyterians in extemporary prayers and preaching, and it is not improbable that the enthusiasm of the people would have gradually subsided, and they would have paid sufficient deference to the Church, had they not been excited by Presbyterian fanatics, who, being deprived of arbitrary power in their General Assemblies, were engaged in practising upon them, and in inflaming their resentment [3]. Nay, even during the establishment of the Episcopal Church, the clergy had their Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, in which, however, instead of the present mode of *pro tempore* election, the Bishop of the diocese, or the Archbishop of the province, was perpetual moderator. In almost every other respect, with the same confession of faith as the standard both of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, until that put forth by the Westminster Assembly, which is now the formulary of the *legal* (Presbyte-

[1] Life of Archbishop Spottiswoode, apud Wodrow MSS. vol. iii. p. 101, 102. Row's MS. Hist. p. 21.

[2] Lord Clarendon's History of the Rebellion.

[3] Skinner's Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, vol. ii.

rian) Church of Scotland, the ecclesiastical government was that against which no moderate Presbyterian could have urged objections.

A liturgy is no essential requisite of Episcopacy, for the Genevans, since Calvin's time, and the Dutch at this day, though not Episcopalians, have a prescribed form of worship. But the necessity of a liturgy is plain and obvious, and besides, it is sanctioned by the Church of the Jews, by the practice of our divine Saviour and his Apostles, by the general consent of the primitive times, and of the Church in all ages. Wanting a liturgy, therefore, the Church of Scotland was radically defective. But there are various historical facts to be noted on this subject. Before the Reformation was established in Scotland in 1560, it was opposed by Mary of Lorraine, the widow of James V., then Queen Dowager and Regent. Devotedly attached to the Romish Church, she sought the destruction of the Scottish Reformers, whose turbulence and insolence had frequently mortified her; and her connexion with France procured for her an army from that country, to aid her in subduing the refractory heretics. The Scots, however, at all times jealous of foreign troops, became the more resolute in their opposition; but the Dowager was too powerful for them without the aid of England. They accordingly applied to Elizabeth, to assist them in expelling the French from their country, and for this service, among other things, they obliged themselves, by a solemn subscription, to adopt the liturgy,

ritual, and constitution of the Church of England in the Scottish Reformed Church [1].

This is a remarkable fact, which has been frequently overlooked, because by it we can judge how far the opposition of the Presbyterians to the Church was justifiable. For, if it be admitted or held forth by them, that forms are not essential to salvation, then it must follow that their non-adherence to this solemn subscription involved them in rebellion, without any farther proof, from the day that Elizabeth granted them assistance, when they failed to perform their engagements. In Knox's time, this resolution was in part adopted, for we find the Reformers enacting, that in all the parishes of the kingdom, the Common Prayer and Lessons should be read weekly on Sundays and other Festivals [2]. But when the Presbyterians prevailed during James' minority, the present fashion of extemporary prayers, aided by the inflammatory conduct of Andrew Melville, brought that liturgy into disrepute. After the re-establishment of the Episcopal Church, James took into his consideration the restoration of the Book of Common Prayer, but he died before his measures were in a condition to be carried into effect. Charles, however, resolved to

[1] Buchanan, who bore a hearty hatred to the whole Episcopal order, does not disguise the fact. "Religionis cultui, et ritibus cum Anglis communibus subscripserunt." Hist. Rer. Scot. lib. xix. edit. 1582. Edin. folio.

[2] Bishop Keith's History of the Church and State of Scotland, folio, p. 66.

pursue his father's plans with respect to Scotland, and he accordingly instructed the Scottish bishops to prepare a liturgy. Dr. John Maxwell, afterwards bishop of Ross, a privy councillor of Scotland, and extraordinary Lord of Session, and successively Bishop of Killala and Archbishop of Tuam [1], was sent to London in 1629, to have an audience of the King on this subject. Charles referred him to Laud, with a message to that prelate, that it was the King's pleasure that Bishop Laud should receive instructions from some bishops of the Church of Scotland concerning a public liturgy for that Church, and that Dr. Maxwell was employed in this business by Dr. John Spottiswoode, the primate of St. Andrew's, and other members of the Episcopal College. Laud informed Dr. Maxwell, that if the King was resolved to have a liturgy in the Scottish Church, different from what that Church already possessed, it would be well to adopt that of the Church of England without any variation, that the service of the two Churches might be uniform; and he added, that he thought it would tend greatly to the welfare of the state, and the advancement of religion. Dr. Maxwell, however, replied, that his opinion was very different, and that he spoke the sentiments of all the Bishops in Scotland when he said, that the Scots would be better pleased with a liturgy of their own, approximating, nevertheless, as nearly as pos-

[1] Bishop Keith's Catalogue of Scottish Bishops, Edin. 1755, 4to. p. 119, 120.

sible to the English. The matter was then reported to the King, who inclined to the introduction of the English Service Book; while the Scots, on the other hand, alleged, that a liturgy drawn up by their own clergy would be more acceptable to the Scots, who were extremely jealous of the independence of their Church, and, were the English liturgy adopted, would be inclined to believe that the Scottish Church was reduced to a dependence on that of England. Thus the matter rested till the present year, 1633. The Scottish bishops were averse to adopt the English Liturgy, though now it is universally adopted in the Scottish Episcopal Church with the exception of a few congregations north of the Tay, by whom the ancient Scottish Communion Office is still retained [1].

I am the more particular on this subject, because it was one of the charges brought against Laud, that he composed the Scottish liturgy, that it was through his influence it was imposed on the people; that he was the "prime cause on earth" of the "innovations in religion" introduced into Scotland: "First, some particular alterations in matters of religion pressed upon the Scots without order, and

[1] Scottish Episcopal Magazine, vol. iii. p. 488. Laud's Troubles and Trials, p. 168, 169. Heylin, p. 222. Collier, vol. ii. p. 755. King Charles' Declaration, &c. London, 1639, folio, p. 16. Wodrow MSS. folio, apud Life of Spottiswoode, p. 165. Crawford's Scottish Officers of the State, p. 174, 175. Clarendon's Hist. vol. i. p. 63, 64. Burnet's Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, p. 30.

against law, contrary to the form established in their Kirk. Secondly, a new book of canons ecclesiastical. Thirdly, a *Liturgy*, or Book of Common Prayer, which did also carry in it many dangerous errors in matters of doctrine[1]." This charge was made by Prynne and other enthusiasts, and is still held forth by writers of a certain class, whereas no charge is more fallacious and unfounded: though, had Laud been the framer of the Scottish Liturgy, it would have been an additional monument of his piety, for, instead of containing "dangerous errors in matters of doctrine," it has been allowed, by some of the greatest divines of the English Church who have filled the Episcopal chair, to be a master-piece of excellence; and, without disparaging the admirable service of their own Church, some of them have declared that, had they their choice, they would make use of the Scottish Episcopal Communion Office in preference to any other[2]. So far from Laud having had any hand in framing the Scottish liturgy, the Bishops at last prevailed upon the King to have the task of compiling it themselves, and "carried it," says Laud, "against me, *notwithstanding all I could say or do to the contrary.*" The King commanded him to give his assistance, which he did with very great reluctance; but no alteration did he make of his own accord, and no sug-

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 166. Prynne, Hidden Works of Darkness, &c. p. 155, &c.

[2] Dr. Russell's edition of Bishop Keith's Catalogue, 8vo.

gestion did he offer, without consulting the King, or writing his remarks in his Sovereign's presence [1].

I leave, however, this subject till the events of the year 1637, a year famous for Scottish fanaticism and turbulence, are introduced. The only transaction worthy of notice at present is the revocation of the tithes, a measure strictly just, and necessary for the support of the Church. At the Reformation, no support had been made for the clergy until they received a grant of the third of all the Popish benefices in the kingdom, and we find Knox more than once denouncing the rapacity of the nobles, who had seized upon all the church lands, and who termed the remonstrances of the Reformed preachers "dreams of devout imaginations [2]." Only a miserable pittance was afforded for the maintenance of the clergy, which in many cases was hardly paid. The object of the turbulent nobles of Scotland was to enrich themselves by appropriating the property of the Church, to which they had not the slightest claim. At the Reformation, also, many of the abbeys had been erected into temporal lordships, their superiors thus securing the property by complying with the disposition of the times; and such lands as did revert to the crown were bestowed by James on his favourites with no sparing hand. The fanaticism of the Presbyterians, on the other hand, increased the rapacity of the nobles, and the

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 168.

[2] Knox's Historie of the Scottish Reformatioun, p. 434, fol. London edit. 1644.

preachers were used only as instruments to further their own aggrandizement. Every thing, in short, conspired to depress the Scottish Church, to deprive it of its temporalities, to which, as established on the ruins of Popery, it was justly entitled; and even the regulations which James had made during his visit to Scotland, tended neither to relieve the poverty of the clergy, nor to diminish their dependence [1].

Thus there was a Protestant Church in Scotland unable to support the clergy, who were consequently poor, depressed, and the vassals, if I may so speak, of those rapacious men who had enriched themselves and their families by taking advantage of the turbulence of the first Reformers. But, though deprived of their just revenues, the Scottish prelates still kept their eyes on their ancient patrimony. The Episcopal College met in 1627, for the specific purpose of forwarding an application to the King; and, by the royal assistance, they anticipated a recovery of their tithes. They had begun to discourse in public on the unjust detention of their inheritance; and, finally, they had been entrusted with the duty of estimating the tithes impropriated in the different parishes. From these impropriations many disadvantages had resulted to the community. The tithes were frequently possessed by

[1] As an instance of the conduct of the Scottish nobles, when the avaricious Regent Morton presented John Douglas to the Archiepiscopal See of St. Andrew's, he allowed him only 100*l.* per annum, and appropriated the revenues to his own use.

persons who had not the slightest claim to them, or to the estate out of which they were paid; and as the Scottish law prohibited the removal of the crops from the fields by the proprietors till the tithes had been carried away by the titulars, the grain, which might have been safely deposited in the store-houses, was not unfrequently destroyed, in consequence of neglecting to remove it when the weather was favourable. The titulars of the tithes, too, instead of paying the clergy, literally did that which was right in their own eyes; they gave them whatever sum they chose, and without regard to regularity of payment. Thus they were kept continually poor, and in many cases unable to discharge their sacred duties.

The revocation of the tithes, and the restitution of the patrimony of the Church, were, as might have been expected, by no means agreeable to the Scottish nobles. Although in almost every case they received a fair valuation, yet they perceived that their influence was diminished, and transferred to a body who would prove powerful opponents to their own selfish purposes. The regulations submitted by the King, on the ecclesiastical property, although just, and tending to the advancement of the public prosperity, irritated those who had long enjoyed the church lands, and who imagined that the King's intention was to wrest them from the possessors, and bestow them on their rightful owners. Hence, from these and other causes, on which it is needless here to enlarge, arose mutual

jealousies between the nobles and the Church, which in the issue were attended with injurious consequences, and enabled the enthusiastic faction which opposed Episcopacy to preserve its influence.

During those domestic transactions, the Scots had acquired on the Continent an unparalleled military reputation, which was farther enhanced by the popular cause in which they were engaged. From their enterprising or vagrant disposition, they had sought that distinction among foreigners which they could not obtain in their own country. A regiment raised by the Highland chieftain, Mackay, Lord Reay, for the service of the King of Denmark, had been honourably discharged at the conclusion of two unsuccessful campaigns against the Imperial forces. The renowned Gustavus Adolphus at that time attracted the attention of all Europe; and the regiment, instead of being dispersed, enlisted under the banners of that invincible monarch. His bounty had been experienced by several Scottish officers; others of their countrymen hastened to acquire glory under a prince who led them to victory; and thus, at length, several regiments were completed, which were all united as a national brigade. The Swedish monarch invaded Germany, and Charles, who was still anxious to restore the Palatinate, engaged to aid him with 6000 men. This army was raised by the Marquis of Hamilton, and the Scots willingly flocked to the standard of the chief of that illustrious House. A succession of victories attended the arms of the Scots in the service of Gustavus,

who fell, however, in battle before Lutzen, in 1632, while his troops were gaining an immortal victory. Before this last battle Hamilton had returned to England, but the Scottish officers and soldiers had acquired such a knowledge of military tactics by their foreign service, and, withal, most extravagant notions concerning civil and religious liberty, tinctured, moreover, with the enthusiasm of the times, as made them formidable enemies when they turned their arms against their sovereign, and began an unnatural war with sectarian violence.

Such was the situation of the Scots, when Charles, having procured tranquillity by the dissolution of his turbulent Parliaments, prepared to visit his native kingdom, and there to receive the Scottish crown by a public inauguration. Though this journey proved the prelude to his future misfortunes, he had many inducements to undertake it. His presence in Scotland had been long expected, it was necessary for him to be crowned in a kingdom which was yet independent; and his delays had been interpreted to his disadvantage by some, who gave out, that if he did not think the Scottish crown worthy of a journey into the kingdom, there might be some other way for its disposal [1]. The religious distractions, too, powerfully influenced the King, who wisely reflected, that, if his presence could allay those fermentations, and promote an harmonious uniformity in both Churches,

[1] Archdeacon Echard's History, vol. i. p. 101, 102.

the national troubles would subside, and the two kingdoms would become firmly consolidated [1]. Not that he was inclined to yield to the Presbyterian faction, the leaders of which were too deeply infected with enthusiasm, to behold any thing which did not favour their own extravagance; but he naturally thought, that he might be enabled to adopt those measures in person, which would at least enjoin peace and obedience on those discontented men. On the 13th of May, 1633, the King left London for Scotland, accompanied by Laud, the Marquis of Hamilton, the Earls of Northumberland, Arundel, Pembroke, Southampton, Holland, and other distinguished persons. Having advanced by slow and easy journeys, on the 24th he made a magnificent entrance into the ancient archiepiscopal city of York, and on the Scottish border he was met by a splendid cavalcade, who attended him in his farther progress. On the 10th of June, Charles entered Edinburgh, the metropolis of the kingdom, by the gate called the West Port. At this gate a speech was addressed to him, flattering and complimentary, from a temporary theatre, and the keys of the city were presented to him by the Provost. In his progress through the city towards the palace, at that part of the High-street named the *Luckenbooths*, the monarch was accosted by another orator, who, with a due profusion of Scottish vanity, edified him by tracing

[1] Collier, vol. ii. p. 754.

his genealogy from his reputed ancestor Fergus I. At the Cross, which is (or was) a few yards distant, an image of Bacchus was seen, discharging, *ex ore*, the copious wine. Farther down the street, where stands the Tron Church, they had erected a Parnassus, on which the Nine Muses appeared at the King's approach, and at the Nether-Bow Gate was an imitation of the planetary system. Meanwhile the bells, which were not then, and are not to this day, remarkable for their agreeable harmony, were rung, cannon discharged, and musical instruments sounded in every street. Poets and poetasters equally exercised their wits in invoking the propitious Muse[1]. The extraordinary pomp and magnificence, the illustrious retinue which accompanied the monarch, the presence of royalty, of which the Scots had been long deprived, and a Prince, too, the representative of their own native monarchs, to whose House the loyal parties of them were enthusiastically attached, once more in that ancient city, where his ancestors for three centuries had swayed the sceptre, and resided as citizens in the venerable halls of Holyrood,—these considerations affected the Scots; they forgot for the moment their religious distractions, when they gazed on the most virtuous prince of the House of Stuart. Loud acclamations were raised by the multitudes: the civic authorities, attended by two hundred and sixty armed youths, dressed in doublets

[1] Sir James Balfour's Annals, vol. i. edited by Mr. J. Haig of the Advocate's Library, Edinburgh.

of white satin, and black velvet breeches, received the King. "Through streets hung with carpets and tapestry, lined with the trained bands of the city, and decorated with pompous, expensive, and absurd pageantry, they conducted him to the palace[1]." Addresses, speeches, and every expression of profound respect, were proffered to the King[2]: it seemed, in short, as if a temporary cessation had been given to the turbulence of the Scots; their propensity to which, and the troubles they have occasioned, have caused their nation, in those days, to be most appropriately designated, "the empire of fanaticism and hypocrisy, of tyranny and rebellion[3]."

On the 15th of June, a court was held at Holyrood House, and Laud was sworn a Privy Counsellor of Scotland on that occasion. On the 18th, the ceremony of the coronation took place. The chapel-royal of Holyrood House, founded by David I. surnamed the Saint, was the place where the King was inaugurated. A splendid procession from the Castle, which is more than a mile distant from the palace, was exhibited; the regalia of Scotland were removed from that fortress of Pictish anti-

[1] Arnot's History of Edinburgh, 4to. Edinburgh, 1779, p. 103. The King's entry cost the city 41,459*l.* 7*s.* Scots, or about 3500*l.* sterling. Register of the Town Council, vol. xiv. p. 329.

[2] ΕΙΣΟΔΙΑ Edinensium in Caroli Regis, Musarum Tutani, Ingressu in Scotiam. Edin. Excud. Hæredes Andreæ Hart. 1633.

[3] Arnot's History of Edinburgh, 4to. p. 104.

quity, carried, in splendid cavalcade, by the Marquis of Hamilton, an office which still belongs to that nobleman, as Premier Duke in Scotland, while the great officers of state followed in the train. Never, since the days of Mary, had such an illustrious retinue assembled in the chapel-royal,—that venerable structure, which was destined to be dilapidated by the sacrilegious hands of Presbyterians. The sermon was preached by Dr. David Lindsay, Bishop of Brechin, from the passage, "And all the people said, God save King Solomon." The virtuous Archbishop Spottiswoode of St. Andrew's, metropolitan and primate, performed the ceremony of the coronation, which was concluded by the most extravagant demonstrations of public joy from the assembled spectators [1].

An incident occurred, however, during this ceremony, which, being connected with Laud, must not be omitted. Dr. Patrick Lindsay, Archbishop of Glasgow, presented himself at the inauguration without those vestments worn by the bishops, and Laud, it is said, with indecent violence thrust him from the left hand of the King, and made his place to be taken by Dr. Maxwell, Bishop of Ross [2]. But, it is to be remarked, that what Laud's enemies term an *indecent violence*, was nothing more than a mere

[1] Laud's Diary, p. 48. Echard, vol. i. p. 104. Heylin, p. 226.

[2] Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 182. W. Spalding's History of Scottish Troubles, 12mo. vol. i. p. 23. Frankland's Annals, Lond. 1681.

hint to the Archbishop; and it need hardly be observed, that Lindsay's mingling with the attendants, and standing near the King's person, without his canonicals, amounted almost to a positive insult. If he hesitated to appear in the ecclesiastical habit, he ought to have absented himself altogether, and not to have given occasion for dispute by visionary and untenable scruples. Laud only wished to preserve that order which was indispensable on the important occasion, and it may be assumed that there was as much attention to form in Lindsay's scruples, as if he had appeared splendidly arrayed. Yet, with all his moderation, and Archbishop Lindsay was unquestionably a *moderate* prelate, it did not save him from being excommunicated in 1638, by the Presbyterian Assembly, and, like the rest of his brethren, deprived of his See [1].

The pageantry and the splendor of this royal visit had led the nobility into expences, which, after the departure of the King, only increased their opposition. It involved them in pecuniary difficulties, and fostered their discontentment, which, not long after, broke out with an overwhelming violence [2]. But the spirit of opposition was chiefly encouraged by the religious zealots. The English Liturgy was read at divine service in the chapel-

[1] Keith's Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops, p. 157.

[2] Clarendon's History, vol. i. p. 79. Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 181, 182. Whitelocke's Memorials, p. 18. Burnet's History of his own Times, vol. i. p. 25. Echard, vol. i. p. 104. Wodrow MSS. vol. iii. ut sup. p. 13.

royal, and it gave great offence to the people. Believing that nothing was acceptable to the Deity, save long and extemporaneous effusions, they viewed the public worship of the Church of England as little better than idolatry. They placed it on the same level with the Popish Missal—the office of the Holy Communion was to them another form of the Mass. And they beheld with regret that Presbytery was treated with contempt, and that its adherents were studiously neglected.

This dissatisfaction was especially cherished by the preachers, whose intolerance had been kept in check since the re-establishment of the Church, and the ratification of the Perth Articles. Their own conduct, indeed, had made them the merited objects of suspicion; nor will the candid mind, which studiously and impartially weighs the subject, wonder that the King should be determined to restrain the polity of Geneva. It must be recollected, that in arrogant pretensions to divine institution and assumption of plenary power, the Presbyterianism of Scotland did not yield, in the seventeenth century, to the Papacy of Rome. If the Pope claimed a spiritual supremacy over every prince in religion, the Presbyterians stoutly disclaimed any dependence upon them. If, during the tyranny of the Romish Church, it was reckoned a damnable crime to arraign a churchman before a legal tribunal; the Presbyterian also asserted that, in religion, he was amenable only to the Presbytery:—nay, if even treason, or impiety, in the most daring

forms, should be uttered in the pulpit, the King and Council had no power to interfere, but must reserve it for the cognizance of the spiritual court; and, it is well known, that the Scottish preachers of the seventeenth century, when in the zenith of their power, have presumed not only to repeal acts of Parliament, but to declare that they were an independent body, and, as such, held meetings, and passed acts, without the consent, and often in defiance of, the royal authority. Thus, there was not only an *imperium in imperio,* but a power erected in the state more arrogant and intolerable than any Romish tribunal. They were, in reality, inquisitors, and they had every thing connected with Popery but the name.

This, however, was not all. The *most eminent* Presbyterian preachers, or rather the *most seditious,* (for, in the days of Charles, the words were synonymous,) were imitated by the inferior grade, whose poverty precluded them from enjoyments, and whose moroseness rendered their conduct more intolerable. Without opulence and learning, they indulged in the most refined pride and austerity. With them the luxuries of life were criminal, its comforts contemptible; unrestrained by religious forms, and abhorring every appearance of external splendor, they acquired a reputation for sanctity among the vulgar, which at once inflamed their enthusiasm. They inculcated the radical principles of supererogation, by teaching their adherents that it was highly meritorious to deny themselves even

innocent gratifications. "They considered," says a Scottish writer, "the deepest guilt, or the highest exertions of piety, to consist in matters to the last degree trifling or absurd. Their divines gave scope to their imagination, in directing those ideal instances of godliness or iniquity. The second and the fourth commandments were the favourite topics of their declamation. They could perceive idolatry in the disposition of a lady's head-dress[1], or the adjusting of her clothes, and multiply, to an inconceivable extent, the variety of transgressions of the Decalogue. The strict observance of the Sabbath they inculcated in its most gloomy austerity. To go on that day to the threshold, or to walk through one's own house, if with a view to any worldly purpose, or even idly, was held a deeper crime than deliberate murder."

Under the control of such political enthusiasts—for the Presbyterian preachers were deep politicians—it is not surprising that the votaries of Calvinism should have relapsed into their wonted fanatical moroseness, when the novelty of the royal visit subsided. Already offended at the use of the English Liturgy, another circumstance inflamed their passions to a greater degree. The Magistrates of Edinburgh gave an entertainment to the King,

[1] James Durham on the Ten Commandments, p. 251, &c. In treating of the second commandment, that enthusiast defines the different modes of sinning against it, which, with his arguments and numerical divisions and subdivisions, amount to upwards of *seven hundred and fifty!*

which, happening to be on a Sunday, as the most advantageous day before the King's departure, was prolonged during the afternoon. This entertainment was held in the Parliament House, and it prevented the afternoon service in the neighbouring Church of St. Giles. Thus disappointed in not hearing some favourite orator declaim against the court and the Episcopal Church, their resentment knew no bounds; they cherished their disgusts, and brooded over revenge.

Two days after the coronation, the Parliament assembled, and Archbishop Spottiswoode preached the opening sermon. At first, the presence of royalty imposed submission, and the members were disposed to be harmonious. Although the Parliament sat only a few days, no less than thirty-two acts were passed. The supplies were liberal; a tax of 400,000*l.* Scots, being granted on land for six years. The King's revocation and restitution of the church lands received its sanction, and, not without some difficulty, the Episcopal Church was finally established. An act was also passed, though it met with considerable opposition, regulating the ecclesiastical habit. These two last acts inflamed the resentment of the Presbyterian party, and it is asserted that the King shewed them a list of the whole assembly, saying, "Gentlemen, I have all your names here, and I well know who will do me service, and who will not, this day." Thirteen noblemen and as many burgesses expressed their

dissent. On the 28th of June the Parliament was dissolved, having sat only eight days.

Laud's attendance on the King had excited the suspicions and the jealousies of the Presbyterians. As they were no strangers to his character, and knew well his opposition to the Calvinistic notions, they were convinced that their favourite projects were hopeless while he preserved his influence. They were more on their guard, and beheld him with greater enmity, from his performing divine service. On the 30th of June, Laud preached before the King, in the chapel-royal at Holyrood House, "which," says Lord Clarendon, "scarce any Englishman had done before him [1]." He discoursed chiefly on the utility of conformity, and reverence for the institutions of the Church. He was heard throughout by a most crowded audience with great attention and applause [2], although the Presbyterians have foolishly endeavoured to deny that fact, by asserting that the audience consisted chiefly of courtiers, because the prejudices of the people against the liturgy were too strong to induce them to attend [3]. But the applause of courtiers was no source of gratification to Laud, and, therefore, the assertion of Dr. Cook, in his History of the Church of Scotland, that "Laud was so much gratified by this ap-

[1] Lord Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, 4to. vol. i. part 1. Oxford. 1816. p. 127. Diary, p. 48. Echard, vol. i. p. 105.

[2] Clarendon, ut sup. p. 127, 128.

[3] Dr. George Cook's Hist. of the Church of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 342, 343.

plause, that he lost no time in urging those changes which it was one design of the King's visit to Scotland to hasten or to accomplish," is completely at variance with his previous conjecture, that "his audience *probably* consisted chiefly of courtiers[1]." The remarks of the noble historian seem to be decisive on this subject, and to refute the Presbyterian evidence, which abounds so much with the spirit of party. "Many were then and still are of opinion, that if the King had then proposed the liturgy of the Church of England to have been received and practised by that nation, it would have been submitted to without opposition; but, upon mature consideration, the King concluded that it was not a good season to promote that business[2]."

But the Presbyterians were more exasperated at the erection of Edinburgh into an Episcopal See, which was done at this time. Hitherto, as the noble historian remarks, "Edinburgh, though the metropolis of the kingdom, and the chief seat of the King's own residence, and the place where the council of state and the courts of justice still remained, was but a borough town within the diocese of the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, and governed in all church affairs by the preachers of the town; who, being chosen by the citizens from the time of Knox, had been the most turbulent and seditious ministers that could be found in the kingdom." The benefices of

[1] Dr. Cook's Hist. ut sup.

[2] Lord Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i. part 1. p. 128.

Edinburgh were reckoned the best in the Church; and the most eminent, or rather the most seditious, ministers were certain to be found there, as is proved from their fanatical and treasonable conduct during the minority of James, and before his accession to the English crown [1]. The jurisdiction of the Archbishop of St. Andrew's was most extensive. Besides the boundaries north of the Forth, it embraced the greater part of the southern counties, and extended to the English border. In Popish times, the government of those parts of this extensive diocese south of that great estuary, was entrusted by the primate to two dignitaries, termed the Officials of Lothian and Teviotdale; after the fall of the superstition, they were managed by similar individuals appointed by the primates [2]. Edinburgh, however, was solely under the control of the preachers; elected by the people, they frequently dictated to the civic authorities, and it was dangerous to oppose them. To suppress this insolence, and to ease the primate in his laborious duties, Charles left behind him a monument of his piety by erecting this necessary bishopric.

Nor was Archbishop Spottiswoode less reluctant to forward the King's intentions. Although his revenues suffered materially from this erection, yet the pious primate was willing to resign this part of

[1] Spottiswoode, p. 320. 321. 324. 330, 334. Dr. Robertson's Hist. vol. ii. p. 95. Scott's Hist. of Scotland, folio, p. 494, 495. Law's Memorials, 4to. Edin. 1817.

[2] There were eight Deans belonging to the diocese of St. Andrew's, and nine to that of Glasgow.

his power and income. The new diocese extended from the Frith of Forth to the neutral town of Berwick, bounded by the sea on one side, and on the other by the bishopric of Galloway, and comprehended the three counties of West, East, and Mid-Lothian. And that the Bishop might have a suitable revenue, the King purchased part of the estates which had belonged to the priory of St. Andrew's from the Duke of Lennox, that nobleman disposing of them at a more moderate price to further the King's piety. The venerable edifice of St. Giles, founded before the year 854 [1], and in more early times merely a parish church, of which first the Bishop of Lindisferne, or Holy Island, in Northumberland, then the Abbot and Canons of Dunfermline, and, finally, the magistracy of Edinburgh, were successively patrons, was constituted the cathedral [2], and Dr. William Forbes, a " very

[1] Simeon Dunelmensis de Gestis Aug. ad An. Dom. 854.

[2] " Et ad hunc effectum ereximus, tenoreque præsentis chartæ nostræ erigimus Ecclesiam Sancti Ægidii (*lie Saint Giles' Kirk*) in Ecclesiam cathedralem : ac ordinamus eandem fore cathedralem ecclesiam dicti nostri erecti Episcopatus ac damus et concedimus eidem omnes libertates, privilegia, et prærogativas cathedrali ecclesiæ incumbere." Charter of Erection, apud Bishop Keith's Catalogue, p. 30. This edifice, which at present is divided into four parish churches, is a splendid Gothic building. Its length from east to west, outside the walls, is 206 feet ; its breadth, at the west-end, is 110 feet, in the middle 129 feet, but at the east only 76 feet. It is adorned with a lofty square tower, which is elevated to the height of 161 feet, beautifully ornamented, and at the top, by four arches, intersecting each other, resembles an imperial crown.

eminent scholar," says the noble historian, "of a good family in the kingdom, who had been educated in the University of Cambridge, was nominated the first Bishop in this his new city." A dean was also chosen, "of good fame and learning," and other persons appointed as the canons or prebends of the new cathedral, with a proper maintenance for each from the revenues of the see. And this the King did, "hoping the better to prepare the people of the place, who were most numerous and richest of the kingdom, to have a due reverence to order and government, and at least to discountenance, if not suppress, the factious spirit of Presbytery which had so long ruled there [1]." But "so unfortunate," remarks Heylin, "was his Majesty with that stubborn nation, that this was also looked upon as a general grievance, and must be thought to aim at no other end than tyranny and Popery, and what else they pleased [2]."

These and other acts of the King, especially the preferment of Archbishop Spottiswoode to the office of Lord Chancellor, and some other prelates as Lords of the Privy Council, irritated the Scots, and, in particular, the Presbyterian faction. Though perhaps unseasonable promotions, they were nevertheless in one view judicious. I have already observed

[1] Lord Clarendon's History, vol. i. part i. p. 131, 132.

[2] Heylin, p. 227. Wodrow MSS. p. 132—135. Bishop Robert Keith's Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops, p. 28—30. Echard, vol. i. p. 105. Bishop Burnet's History of his Own Times, vol. i. p. 27. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 241.

that there had been hitherto little more than the name of Episcopacy in Scotland; and we have the authority of the noble historian, among numerous others, for the fact. They had no power to reform their own cathedrals; they rarely appeared in the episcopal habit, lest they should inflame the fanaticism of the zealots, and, in point of jurisdiction, they were frequently vanquished by the General Assembly. These disadvantages were improved, in the meanwhile, by the Calvinistic preachers, who were strengthening themselves, and extending their influence. It was to counteract their practices that Charles adopted these measures; and we must judge of the motives, in the first instance, before we discuss the unhappy effects.

After disposing of honours with no sparing hand, granting no fewer than twenty new patents for nobility, and erecting several towns into royal boroughs, the King undertook a journey through various counties. From Edinburgh he proceeded to Linlithgow, and after a short residence in the magnificent palace there, now a melancholy ruin, where his unfortunate grandmother, Mary, was born, the heiress of the misfortunes of her ancestors, he visited Dunfermline, where he himself was born, where was then a royal palace, and sacred as being the burial place of Malcolm III. and his Queen, the pious Margaret, but still more sacred for containing the sepulchre of the heroic Robert Bruce. From that town he proceeded through Fife to Falkland, where is the magnificent and stately palace, the

most modern of the Scottish royal residences, and from Falkland to Perth, a city famous in Scottish story. At Dupplin Castle, the splendid mansion of the Earl of Kinnoull, Charles and his retinue were sumptuously entertained by that nobleman, and thence he returned to Falkland. Laud accompanied Charles in these journies, occasionally visiting, however, some of the neighbouring towns. On July 1, we find the prelate at Burntisland, in Fife, and on the 2d at St. Andrew's, the archiepiscopal residence of the primate. There the monuments of reforming fanaticism, effected by Knox, met his eye, in the sacrilegious demolition of the venerable cathedral. On the 3d, he crossed the Tay to Dundee, and on the following day he returned to Falkland, and joined the King. Accompanying the monarch to Perth on the 7th, he proceeded, on the 8th, to Dunblane, an ancient episcopal city, erected by David II., and then governed by Dr. Adam Bellenden, its Bishop; and thence to Stirling, the favourite residence of the Scottish Kings. In his Diary, he notes his "dangerous and cruel journey, crossing part of the Highlands by coach, which was reckoned a wonder there." From Stirling, he journied to Linlithgow, on the 9th, and thence to the Scottish metropolis, which is 17 miles distant.

That Laud was not with the King during the whole of this progress, is evident from his notation of Charles' dangerous passage from Burntisland to Edinburgh, on the 10th. On that day the King left Falkland, and arrived at Burntisland, a delight-

ful town on the coast, overlooking the fertile plains of the Lothians. There the counties of Fife and Mid-Lothian, are divided by that great estuary or arm of the sea, called the Frith of Forth, which receives the waters of the river Forth, the Bodotria of the ancient Romans. In this estuary, which expands from two to nearly twenty miles in breadth, frequently rage dreadful storms, rendering its passage at times extremely hazardous. One Scottish monarch, Alexander III., had narrowly escaped its dangerous waves, and the monument of gratitude for his safety is still, although a ruin, on the island of Inchcolm. Frequently, too, storms suddenly arise in this estuary, overtaking the passenger ere he is aware. Charles and his attendants embarked at Burntisland in open boats, but, in crossing, a violent storm arose. His life was in extreme jeopardy. One boat, which conveyed some of his attendants, and contained his plate and money, was engulphed before his eyes. After considerable exertion, he landed in safety at Leith, and proceeded to Edinburgh. He speedily left the metropolis, to return to England. On the 16th of July, the King arrived at Berwick, and four days afterwards he joined the Queen's court at Greenwich, after an absence of little more than two months[1].

Numerous were the congratulations which Charles received on his safe return. Poems and odes were

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. i. part ii. p. 179—184.

written, some of them by the most distinguished men of that age [1]. The King, however, felt disappointed, for his visit to his ancient kingdom had not conciliated the people. The nobles began to feel the effects of that expensive splendour in which they had indulged with a profusion exceeding their scanty resources, while the Presbyterian preachers, and their adherents, were exasperated because their enthusiasm had not been encouraged. The promotion of Archbishop Spottiswoode and other prelates to the helm of affairs, was a cause of their deeply-cherished hatred, nor did they fail to inflame the people who listened to their harangues. Politics were introduced into their extemporary prayers, their sermons abounded with expressions of their prejudices; their gloomy moroseness, and their unconquerable pride, aided their dangerous fanaticism. In the following year, too, the share which the primate had in procuring the condemnation of Lord Balmerino, on a charge of lease-making, served still more to exasperate the people. That nobleman's life was indeed spared by the intercession of Laud, but the people forgot the King's

[1] Solis Brittanici Perigæum, sive Itinerantis Caroli auspicatissima Periodus. Oxon. Excud. Johan. Lichfield et Gul. Turner, Ann. Dom. 1633, 4to. Rex Redux, sive Musa Cantabrigiensis voti damnando mcolumitate et felici reditu Regis Caroli post receptam Coronam, Comitiaque peracta in Scotia, Cantab. 1633, 4to. p. 88. Summus Dux, cum Duce Redux. 4to. p. 1. Vivat Rex, sive Προσευκτικὸν, &c. 4to. Aberdoniæ, 1633, p. 9.

humane disposition in the ebullitions of enthusiasm, and the fermentations fostered by religious zealots[1].

The Marquis of Hamilton was entrusted by the King with the levying of the taxes—a nobleman, who, a steady royalist, was deservedly popular, though suspected of being partial to the Presbyterians. It was not, however, imagined by the King that much had been done to allay the public discontentment. The appointment of Spottiswoode to the Chancellorship, although he was a prelate, learned, wise, pious, and of long experience, was rather premature; and the conduct of the Bishop of Ross, who solicited the Lord Treasurer's office, deeply offended the Earl of Traquair, who had been long a secret enemy to the Church. Indeed, it may be doubted, whether the Scottish Bishops acted at this juncture with prudential caution, considering their peculiar circumstances, and the faction opposed to them; for, though the Presbyterian assertion, that the younger prelates were anxious to ensure Laud's favour, and, therefore, zealous for innovation, as they are pleased to term it, must be received with considerable doubt, inasmuch as Presbyterians have very peculiar notions on innovation, nevertheless, in some instances, it must be admitted that there was an undue stretch of power in their transactions with the opposing religionists. Yet, there is this fact to be considered,

[1] Burnet, vol. i. p. 31. State Trials, p. 291.

that the Church could not tamper with the Presbyterians, the latter were even beyond the possibility of reconciliation; to yield to them in one particular, was to afford a pretext for future demands; in short, the two parties were diametrically opposite, nor did they wish to be reconciled.

Before the King's departure, he appointed a committee of the Bishops to compile a Liturgy, and to correspond with Laud on the subject. In the mean time, not to anticipate, Laud, having no particular cause to hasten home, did not return from Scotland to his palace of Fulham, till the 26th of July. There he employed himself for a few days in the arrangement of his domestic concerns.

But an event at this time took place, which at once marked the commencement of a new era in the life of Laud. On the 4th of August, 1633, Archbishop Abbot finished his unhappy primacy, at his palace of Croydon, in the seventy-first year of his age. Having already said much on the conduct of this celebrated primate, it is unnecessary here to enlarge. That his laxity of government in the archiepiscopal see, and his public patronage of the Puritan faction, tended to the overthrow of the Church, cannot be questioned; his government, in truth, entailed on his successor a series of misfortunes. Had Abbot prosecuted those measures adopted by Whitgift and Bancroft; had he zealously drawn the line of demarcation between the Church and the sectaries, and had he made it an invariable rule to admit none into the Church of whose attachment he was

not well assured, it would have made head against all its adversaries, and, under the government of Laud, it would have presented to its factious enemies an impenetrable phalanx, which they might perhaps have assailed, but assailed in vain. And, whatever might have been his own notions concerning predestination, had he refrained from countenancing the Calvinistic subtleties, which excited so many distractions in the nation; and had he been actuated less by a vindictive spirit towards those who denied the predestinarian tenets, against whom he continually declaimed as semi-papists, he would have merited well of the Church of England, though, doubtless, he would have received less of sectarian praise. But his procedure all along was the very reverse; and to his unhappy primacy may be traced the origin of many of those evils which afterwards distracted the kingdom. That he was pious and sincere, cannot be questioned; his learning was extensive, and his works, which yet remain, are honourable to his talents and acquirements. But he was infected with enthusiasm; in his haste to recede from Popery he fell into the opposite extreme of Puritanism, and in his old age his house became a constant resort for the heads of that faction, who, because they visited him by night, received the appellation of Nicodemites. His inveterate hostility to Laud, which he manifested throughout life, from the first appearance of the latter at the University, will be condemned by every liberal mind; and it may be greatly doubted, if the comparison were

drawn between these two prelates, whether the charge of bigotry ought not to be applied with more propriety to the *mild and liberal* low-churchman, Abbot, than to the alleged *intolerant and illiberal* high-churchman, Laud. Few, indeed, do I find among the writers of that age, Sectarians and Puritans excepted, who do not unite in condemning Abbot's laxity; and from the noble historian he has received a censure no less severe than merited [1].

Intimation of the Primate's death reached the court that very day, and the King lost no time in appointing his successor. The first time Laud appeared at court, he was accosted by the King in these words, "My Lord's Grace of Canterbury, you are very welcome." On the 6th of August he was promoted to the primacy; on the 25th his election was returned to the King at Woodstock, and on the 19th of September he was formally translated, having secured the appointment of his friend and fellow-student, Dr. William Juxon, to succeed him in the diocese of London [2].

At this time a remarkable offer was made to Laud,

[1] Clarendon, vol. i. part i. p. 134—136. Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. i. col. 585. Fuller, book xi. p. 128. Sir Roger L'Estrange's Charles I. p. 127. Sanderson, p. 531. Aubrey's Antiq. of Surrey, vol. iii. p. 287. Heylin, p. 229—231. and History of the Presbyterians, p. 389. Fuller's Worthies of England—Surrey, p. 83. Lloyd's State Worthies, p. 749.

[2] Echard, vol. i. p. 105. Diary, p. 49. Whitelock's Memorials, p. 18.

on which his enemies have expatiated with great indecency. On the very morning of Abbot's death, a person came to him secretly, and offered him a cardinal's hat, protesting, at the same time, that he was able to obtain what he then proffered to the new primate. On the 17th of August, the offer was renewed, and on both occasions Laud informed the King. His answer to the person who made this offer was, "that something dwelt within him, which would not suffer that, till Rome was otherwise than it was at the present time[1]." His second refusal was decisive.

The charge that Laud was affected towards Popery, is now almost given up even by his most virulent enemies, and the motives which could induce the Papists to make this offer remain in obscurity. It may be doubted whether it actually proceeded from Rome, or whether some of the Jesuits had not merely adopted the expedient to ascertain how far Laud was inclined to tolerate the Papists. They well knew that he was their most virulent enemy, but yet the acceptance of the Hat would not have been derogatory to Laud as Primate of the Church of England. For though it would indeed have been a wonderful circumstance to have seen a Protestant a member of the College of Cardinals, still, the honour would have been merely nominal, and in the same light as temporal princes sometimes enjoy the title of Bishop. The King of England is Arch-

[1] Diary, p. 49.

Treasurer of the Holy Roman Empire, but it does not follow that he must be a member of the Roman Catholic Church.

It is impossible to believe that the Papists hoped by this measure to reconcile Laud to the Church of Rome, otherwise they were most erroneous speculators. "A cardinal's cap," says our Church historian, "could not fit *his* head who had studied and written so much against the Romish religion. He who formerly had foiled Fisher himself in a public disputation, would not now be taken with so silly a bait, but acquainted the King therewith. *Timuit Romam, vel dona ferentem,* refusing to receive any thing till Rome was better reformed." Whitelocke imputes to Laud another motive for his refusal, which is extremely superficial. "Laud," says he, "was offered a cardinal's cap from Rome, but he refused, being as high already as England could advance him, and he would not be second to any in another kingdom." This reason, however, carries with it its own refutation. Already had Laud a superior in the person of the King, whose temporal supremacy the Church acknowledges in ecclesiastical matters; nor, had Laud really accepted the offer, would it at all have interfered with his station as Primate and Metropolitan of the Church of England. But he refused from other and more honourable motives; he would accept nothing, he said, from Rome, "till it was otherwise than what it was."

This jesuitical offer, granting that it was sincere,

was intended, it appears to me, as an experiment. It is to be remarked, that the conduct of the Puritans had given occasion to those sophistical proceedings. While the Church of England admitted that the Church of Rome was a true Church, the Puritans, on the other hand, denied this fact, and asserted that it was not only Antichrist, and the Beast of the Apocalypse, but that its communion was damnable, it was one entire mass of corruption and idolatry. This opinion was the result of their outrageous fanaticism. Popery is indeed bad; it abounds with numerous errors,—and errors which are lamentably dangerous and delusive to all its votaries, whether enlightened or ignorant: yet, were Protestants to reject all that Papists believe, they would speedily reject Christianity. With the Puritans, however, this was inconceivable. They affirmed, with the most unparalleled bigotry, that Papists were not Christians,—that they believed not one single doctrine of the gospel,—that they were gross idolaters. The Scotch Calvinists had made the notable discovery, that Popery had not such high claims to antiquity as Judaism,—that Mahommedanism was a religion infinitely preferable to Roman Catholicism; and, therefore, they denounced all who presumed even to hold converse with them, as sharers in idolatrous commerce. The same monstrous notions prevailed amongst the English Puritans, which were the effects of those opinions they entertained respecting the polity of the Church. While the Episcopalian avoided this phrensy, he struck at Popery

a more deadly blow. That the Church of Rome is a true Church, cannot be denied; in fundamentals it agrees with every Protestant: it has equally one faith, one hope, one baptism; but it is woefully corrupt, overwhelmed in superstition; and its politics are directly subversive of a well-regulated state, unless controlled by the strong and salutary arm of power. Its transubstantiation, purgatory, prayers for the dead, vain and mechanical ceremonies, invocations of saints, assumption of plenary power and of universal rule, restriction of the priesthood, and investment of the Bishop of Rome with the headship of the Church on earth,—these, and many other untenable and absurd superstitions, do not militate against the assertion that it is fundamentally a true Church. They prove it to be woefully degenerate and corrupt, but do not prove it false; nay, though it were one entire mass of leaven, still its ordination is sacred and apostolic: but much more is it a true Church, amidst all its declensions and apostacies, when it admits and asserts the fundamental doctrine of the Trinity, and holds our divine Saviour to be the Son of God. And if it be divested of this character of a true though a corrupt Church, where, then, is the Church of England? Where the validity of the sacred office of ordination? Where that apostolical transmission of its orders, which Dissenters and Schismatics affect to treat as visionary and absurd? Believing much more to be implied in valid ordination than what Dissenters are taught to believe, or

are willing to allow, it appears to me that were the Church of England to deny that the corrupt communion of Rome is a true Church, it would immediately degenerate into a mere sectarian association.

Nor does this concession to the Church of Rome in the least degree countenance its declension and apostacy: on the contrary, it places that Church in a far more dangerous situation; it charges it with wilful perversion of the canon of inspiration, with a crafty admission of vain and fabulous traditions, with an unjust and a merciless domination over the bodies and the souls of men. Such were Laud's sentiments; and, while he admitted that it was a true church, he denied its supremacy and exclusive Catholicism. Nay, so far from his being enticed by the title of Cardinal, in his book against Fisher, *he objects to this title,* and asserts, in the most unqualified manner, the absurdity of the Pope's supremacy, as the successor of St. Peter, who was vested with no other power than the other apostles and bishops of the Church. His rejection of the offer, therefore, in these significant words, "*till Rome should be other than it now is;*" to which his Puritan enemy, Prynne, maliciously and falsely added, "*and then he would not refuse,*" is not only honourable to himself, but at once proves that he had not, as Neal asserts, "an imaginary scheme of uniting the two Churches of England and Rome," and that he deprecated any reconciliation till the work of reformation had begun in Rome,

and swept away every erroneous doctrine and vain superstition[1].

[1] Rome's Masterpiece, written by William Prynne, with the Archbishop's Notes, apud Dr. Henry Wharton's edition of the "Troubles and Trials," &c. p. 596, 597.

CHAPTER XIV.

1633—1635.

Enthronement of Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury—Remarks on his general character—Libels against him—Is elected Chancellor of the University of Dublin—His vigorous proceedings—Directions on ordinations—Revival of the Book of Sports—Remarks—William Prynne—His prosecution—Instance of his cunningness—The Archbishop's primary visitation—The Communion-table—Remarks on the primate's conduct—Bishop Williams—Absurdity of some Puritan objections—The foreign congregations—Laud's proceedings—History of the affair—Defence of his conduct—The London Clergy—Their situation in the reign of Charles I.—Their hardships—The Irish Church—Bishop Bedell—Correspondence between Laud and Lord Wentworth—The Archbishop's state appointments—His remarkable disinterestedness.

We have now followed Laud throughout the history of his eventful life, to his elevation to the Metropolitan See of Canterbury, when he was sixty years of age. On this important occasion, in answer to a letter of congratulation from his chosen friend and confident, Wentworth, he thus feelingly and piously writes, "I heartily thank you for your kind wishes to me, that God would send me many and happy days where I now am to be. Amen! I can do little for myself, if I cannot say so; but truly,

my Lord, I look for neither: not for many, for I am in years, and have had a troublesome life,—not for happy, because I have no hope to do the good I desire[1]." We have seen this great man neglected in his youth, and permitted to languish on a Fellowship, none of the most lucrative, at St. John's College, till the vigour of his days was almost past, and then we see him discharging with applause the arduous and important duties of three successive dioceses, while he was at the same time actively employed in numerous important avocations. "He was always maligned and persecuted," says the noble historian, "by those who were of the Calvinistic faction, which was then very powerful, and who, *according to their usual maxim and practice*, call every man they do not love Papist, and, under this senseless appellation, they created him many troubles and vexations, and so far suppressed him, that, though he was the King's Chaplain, and taken notice of for an excellent preacher, and a scholar of the most sublime parts, he had not any preferment to invite him to leave his poor College, which only gave him bread, till the vigour of his age was past; and, when he was promoted *by King James*, it was but to a poor bishopric in Wales, which was not so good a support for a bishop, as his College was for a private scholar, though a Doctor[2]."

[1] Strafford's Letters, vol. i.

[2] Lord Clarendon, vol. i. part 1. Oxford Edit. 4to. p. 136, 137.

It is gratifying to find such a testimony borne by the noble historian to Laud's uprightness, talents, and exemplary virtues. "His promotion to Canterbury was long foreseen and expected," says he, "nor was it attended with any increase of envy or dislike[1]." It might have been reasonably thought, that the elevation of Laud,—a prelate so totally opposed to his predecessor's notions, would have been a measure attended with some popular excitement: but it was the reverse; the Puritan faction was either wearied with its fruitless opposition, or revolving in secret, which is most likely, its dark and rebellious designs. Not, indeed, that his enemies were at all disposed to peace. Shortly after his promotion, a fanatic, named Boyer, was brought into the Star Chamber, and censured for libelling him in the most abusive manner; and another was committed to Newgate for appearing at St. James' with a drawn sword, swearing that the King should do him justice, or he would take the law into his own hands[2]. In December following, we also find him hinting, in a mysterious manner, of the falsehood and treachery practised against him by one of his pretended friends, of which the King himself gave him notice. Yet, notwithstanding these acts of religious phrensy and false friendship, we find him serene and un-

[1] Lord Clarendon, ut sup. p. 136.

[2] Diary, p. 49. "All the wrong I ever did this man was, that being a poor printer, I procured him of the Company of Stationers 5*l*. a-year during his life."

moved, expressing himself with pious feeling, conscious of his own integrity of heart.

On Laud's removal to Lambeth, an accident occurred, which the superstitious vulgar afterwards remembered as a prognostication of his fate. When he first went to Lambeth, after his promotion to the primacy, on crossing the Thames, his "coach, horses, and men," were plunged into the river, by the overloading of the ferry boats. Luckily, however, no lives were lost. This escape he has mentioned in his Diary as a signal deliverance [1].

Laud, elevated to the highest dignity in the Church, employed himself zealously to correct the negligence of his predecessor. No man could restrain him in his salutary measures, and few, indeed, ventured to oppose him; though, previously to this period, he had little interposed in matters of state. The University of Oxford sent him a congratulatory letter, bearing date the 12th of September [2], and, on the 14th of that month, he was elected Chancellor of the University of Dublin [3]. Thus vested with the government of the Church, and at the head of two famous Universities, he possessed an influence which had fallen to the lot

[1] Diary, p. 49.

[2] Echard's History, vol. i. p. 106. "Reverendiss. Antistes, summopere gratulamur fortunæ nostræ quod nunc demum Epistolam lecturus es, nec agnoscentem nec rogantem beneficia nec gratiarum actione blandam nec ambitu molestam," &c. Reg. fol. 706. Oxon.

[3] Diary, p. 50.

of few before him, who had filled the metropolitan see. These elevations, however, prove that he was expected to do much for the Church of England, and that the eyes of its sincere well-wishers were turned towards him.

The first direction which the Archbishop received from the court was a letter from the King, referring to candidates for ordination; and, in compliance with the royal injunction, he published an injunction, which is now enforced by the Church, that no person should be admitted into priest's orders without a title. This injunction to the suffragans is dated the 18th of October, requiring them, "at all times of ordination, that they be careful to admit none into holy orders, but such men as for life and learning are fit, and who have a title for their maintenance according to the laws and the ancient practice of the Church:" assuring them "that his Majesty had commanded him to let them know, that he would not fail to call for an account of those his letters, both from him and them; and, therefore, that he did not doubt but that they would have a special care, both for the good of the Church, and his Majesty's satisfaction[1]." Letters were also sent by the King to Neile, Archbishop of York, and by that excellent prelate were communicated to his four suffragan bishops. This, though not the origin, as the Puritans alleged, was the establishment, of a law, which has ever since

[1] Heylin, p. 240, 241. Collier, vol. ii. p. 757, 758.

been regularly enforced in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Yet, it is a remarkable fact, that, though this law contained nothing which was not set forth in the Canon of 1603, which, grounded on the old canons, expressly declares, "that no person shall be admitted into holy orders, except he shall exhibit to the bishop, of whom he desires ordination, a presentation to some ecclesiastical living then vacant in the diocese," or that he is to serve a cure of souls, either in a Cathedral or a Collegiate Church, or that he be a Fellow or Chaplain to some College, or a Master of Arts of five years standing, and residing in the University at his own expence,"—it was as much excepted against, as if it had been a "new decree," a serious innovation. The reason is obvious. It had been enacted, that "if any bishop do ordain a man without a title to a cure of souls, or the discharge of particular ecclesiastical duty, he shall be obliged to maintain such person till he be presented to a benefice, under pain of suspension from granting orders for one year;" but the bishops of those dioceses whose revenues were by no means proportionate to their wants, had admitted into the priesthood, for their own benefit, men who had no title, and sometimes no merit, "by means of which," observes Dr. Heylin, "the Church was filled with indigent clerks, who either thrust themselves into gentlemen's houses to teach their children, and to act as chaplains at table, or undertook some stipendiary lecture, wheresoever

they could find it, to the great fomenting of faction in the state, the danger of schism in the Church, and the ruin of both." This laxity of discipline was consequently productive of the very worst consequences in the Church, and tended to degrade the ecclesiastical order, by causing it to be overrun by men, whose indigence would naturally prompt them not to be over-scrupulous about their employment, and who, in the matter of lectureships, would become time-servers to those in whom the right of election was vested. But, by this law, the presentations, and the candidate's testimonials, were laid before the bishop, sufficient time was given to investigate their validity, and the merit of the person applying for ordination; and it was doubly necessary in that age of enthusiasm, when zealots were every where undermining the Church, and erecting themselves into a powerful party. The unhappy primacy of Abbot had admitted many of those individuals into the Church, who, in the issue, united with sectarians and fanatics in overthrowing the civil and ecclesiastical constitution.

The principal design of the injunction, however, seems to have been to restrain the lecturers, towards whom Charles and the Archbishop entertained a merited dislike. For this purpose, a presentation or election to a lectureship was not reckoned a valid title, because a lectureship is not a cure of souls, the meaning of a valid title being a prospect of some immediate maintenance, to prevent the Church from being overrun by indigent, itinerant, and

unqualified ministers. Laud, therefore, declared what would be sufficient to constitute a valid title, and in this he acted strictly according to the law and ancient practice of the Church, namely, 1. "A presentation to some ecclesiastical preferment: or, 2. a certificate *undoubted*, that the candidate is provided with some church in the diocese then vacant: or, 3. A grant of a canon's place in a cathedral or collegiate church: or, 4. A Fellow, or in the right of a Fellow, in some college of Oxford or Cambridge; or, 5. A chaplaincy in some of the colleges: or, 6. A Master of Arts of five years standing, living at his own charge in either of the Universities: or, 7. The intention of the Bishop that ordains shortly to admit him to some benefice or curacy then vacant." And it was farther provided, that no person admitted a curate should be deprived by the incumbent, unless for immoral conduct by him committed after his ordination [1].

The wisdom of these injunctions is sufficiently obvious; and this first act of the Archbishop denotes his zealous care for the Church. For, as I have already said, the lecturers, being the *protegés* of popular election, were liable to be dismissed at pleasure by their patrons, and thus reduced to indigence; and in like manner, those who were chaplains were equally under the control of those who entertained them. It no doubt struck at the very root of popular election, which is so much extolled by certain Dissenters; but that species of patronage is neither

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. p. 213—215.

sanctioned by the Church in primitive times, nor at any subsequent period. To those, indeed, whose religion, like that of the Puritans and Presbyterians, consists in *mere preaching*, popular election is of importance, as otherwise they cannot have their individual taste for declamatory harangues gratified; and the exaltation of the most illiterate mechanic or the most factious demagogue to be the patron of his minister, is gratifying to the pride of ignorance and self-sufficiency. But when we recollect, that preaching, as a mere act, is vastly inferior to almost all the other ecclesiastical duties; that sermons are nothing more than the mere opinions of a frail, erring, and sinful man; that preaching, characterized by ignorance, declamation, enthusiasm, and a peculiar phraseology, often encourages spiritual pride, fostersfanatical prejudices, and, in all such cases, makes "the enticing words of man's wisdom" to be held in more estimation than the "word of God, which maketh wise unto salvation," we shall at once be convinced, that the notions of those are most erroneous, who make a boast of their independency, and exult in what they facetiously term popular calls and elections. On the other hand, when we recollect, that the public devotional services of the Church are far superior to any sermons or lectures however excellent, because they are all grounded upon the canon of inspiration, and, in reality, inspiration itself; when we recollect, that the administration of the holy sacraments is perhaps the chief end of valid ordination, we shall at once admit the wisdom of Laud in establish-

ing these injunctions. Preaching or lecturing is not the essential part of a minister's duty; in truth, any man may do either of these, but who will dare to call himself a member of the Church, and perform its regular ecclesiastical duties, without having received its ordination?

On the very day on which those injunctions were transmitted to the suffragans by Archbishop Laud, to be adopted, in all future time, as the law of the Church, appeared the King's Declaration concerning Lawful Sports, which the Archbishop was charged with having revived and extended. This excited against him the violent hatred of the Puritans and other sectaries, who failed not to remember it on a future occasion. At this time the Sabbatarian controversy was revived by one Theophilus Bradburne, a clergyman in Suffolk; who, in a book which he published and dedicated to the King, advanced certain Jewish notions concerning the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. He maintained that the commandment is strictly moral; that Christians as well as Jews are bound to observe it; that Sunday is a mere working day, deserving no preference, and that it is will-worship and superstition to keep it with the solemnity of a sabbath. For these opinions, and more especially for dedicating his book to the King, who was by no means desirous of being regarded as the patron of such extravagances, he was called before the High Commission, where he met with a severity which compelled him to abstain from the publication of his

unseasonable sentiments, and to conform to the Church during the remainder of his life. Those notions, however, had been disseminated throughout the country, and the Justices in Somersetshire signed a petition to the King to suppress Church-ales, Clerk-ales, Wakes, &c. But before this petition was delivered, the Declaration concerning Sports, published in the last reign, with a supplement by the King, appeared, which at once excited the discontent of the people [1].

It is to be observed, that the professed design of King James' Book of Sports was to restrain the intercourse with other parishes on the Sundays, and to remove that erroneous idea which the Papists had conceived respecting the Protestant religion, from the gloomy and morose conduct of the Puritans. This, it must be confessed, was a dangerous expedient to allure the Romanists; but it is certain that this Declaration would not have been revived, had it not been for the extravagant zeal of the Lord Chief Justice Richardson, who, in the year 1631, had assumed the power in his own person of prohibiting every amusement, and who commanded his order to be published at the door of the parochial churches. This being an encroachment on the functions of the Bishop of the diocese, without whose knowledge it was done, Laud complained of it to the King; but Richardson, so far from revoking his order, made it

[1] Collier, vol. ii. p. 758. Fuller, book xi. p. 144. Heylin, p. 243. Neal, vol ii. p. 250.

more rigorous than before. Laud afterwards wrote to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, to transmit to Court a full account of the feasts called Wakes, and whether the disorders arising from them might not be remedied, without prohibiting the feasts themselves. The Bishop returned an answer, certified by upwards of seventy of his clergy, that "the ancient custom of those feasts was laudable and innocent, that the late suppression was unpopular, and that their restitution would be acceptable to the people at large." This, and other remonstrances from the county of Essex, caused Richardson to be reproved at the Council Table, for an assumption of authority which did not belong to him; and so severely was he rebuked by Laud, in particular, that he ran out exclaiming, "That he had been almost choaked with a pair of lawn sleeves." At the next assizes he was compelled to revoke his order, which he did with considerable reluctance.

The extreme of Puritanism on this subject drove the Government into a contrary one, which in its effects was more unfortunate; for the King, harassed by petitions from numerous parties of enthusiasts, and by the puritanical notions of the Sabbath, tending to absolute Judaism, resolved to follow his father's example; and the Book of Sports made its appearance, when it gave greater offence, because the Clergy were compelled to publish the Declaration, under penalty of cognizance by the High Commission. No sooner was it published, than the Puritans commenced a universal clamour. Some abused

the King, and termed the Declaration a "profane edict," a "maintaining of his own honour," "a toleration for profaning the Lord's Day;" while others charged Archbishop Laud with the whole affair, "and made it," says Heylin, "the first remarkable thing which was done presently after he took possession of his *Graceship*, as Burton remarked wittily in his pulpit libel." At his trial it was brought against him with increased malignity, but, though he denied it, he admitted that he was not an enemy to innocent recreations on Sundays. "That some are lawful," says he, "after the public service of God is ended, appears by the practice of Geneva, where, after evening prayer, the elder men bowl, and the younger train[1];" and this was done even in Calvin's time, who did not want authority to denounce those practices had he been so inclined. And, in proof, he quotes that remarkable passage from Calvin's Institutes, "That those men who stand so strictly on the morality of the Sabbath, do, by a gross and carnal sabbatizing, three times exceed the superstition of the Jews[2]:" adding, also, remarks the Church historian, that, "though indulging liberty to others, in his own person he strictly observed that day—a *self-praise*, or rather *self-purging*, because spoken during his life, which, uttered without pride, and with truth, was not clearly confuted. Indeed, they are the best carvers of liberty on that

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 343.

[2] Ibid, ut sup. p. 345. Institut. c. viii. § 34.

day, who cut most for others, and keep least to themselves [1]."

Although the clergy were not positively enjoined in the Declaration to publish it in their churches, many were silenced, and called to account, who refused to comply; but it is remarkable, that none were called into the High Commission on this occasion who were not chargeable with other acts of contumacy and turbulence. These proceedings will be afterwards noticed; yet it may be here observed, that various were the shifts and evasions to which those had recourse whose consciences restrained them from compliance. Some left it to their curates —a miserable subterfuge, as if, granting that the order was grievous, the sin of it could be removed by thus recommending it to them; others read it, but immediately after proclaimed the fourth commandment; while others positively refused. Yet it is no less remarkable, that in Archbishop Laud's own diocese, though he was charged with the whole transaction, only three prosecutions took place, and these were individuals against whom other accusations were laid. His enemies, no doubt, alleged this as policy on his part, and not as any inclination towards lenity, in order that his own purposes might be served, while the other prelates appeared the active agents. They knew well, however, that they were libelling his character; for, even had Laud been endowed with supernatural foresight, he would have

[1] Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 147, 148.

disdained such dastardly conduct; much more so, when he conscientiously believed he was doing his duty, and when there were no indications of his future troubles. If, as the noble historian remarks, "he designed that the discipline of the Church should be felt, as well as spoken of, and that it should be applied to the greatest and most splendid transgressors, as well as to the punishment of smaller offences, and meaner offenders, and thereupon called for or cherished the discovery of those who were not careful to cover their own iniquities, thinking they were above the reach of other men, or their power or will to chastise;" if such was the case, can it be thought that this great primate would have recourse to sinister practices, to gratify himself, and yet endeavour to secure himself from odium, or from the aspersions of the Puritans, whom he deservedly disliked, and viewed as the most dangerous innovators? The whole course of his life is a practical denial of the charge.

Although the Puritan notions were most extravagant on religion, yet, at the same time, I greatly doubt whether it was altogether prudent to revive the Book of Sports, nor am I disposed to defend the measures then adopted to compel the clergy to read the Declaration, which, although Laud might not have had any active hand in it, was nevertheless sanctioned by his silence. It is not that I believe this Declaration to have encouraged profanation, for if men are inclined to licentiousness, they will gratify themselves without the countenance of a

royal declaration, or a "Book of Sports." It is evident, too, that there was little real religion among the Puritans, and that they employed themselves more in exciting the turbulence of their associates than in advancing rational piety. Religious pretence is often unhappily used as a specious garb, which can be employed for a variety of purposes by dangerous and designing men, and the religious zealot is seldom an humble Christian. But it caused complaints against the King and the Archbishop; it made the people charge the public administration with irreligion and profaneness, insomuch that, though the Declaration was soon forgotten, it was wished by many that it had never been revived.

I have now, however, to notice an affair of a very different description, in which Laud was engaged at this time, as a member of the Star-Chamber and High Commission Courts. Prynne, the author of the famous Histrio Mastyx, had been committed to the Tower for being the author of that work, and Heylin had been appointed to analyze it, and lay all the obnoxious passages before the Attorney General. This unfortunate and fanatical author of nearly two hundred volumes, the undigested offspring of an undisciplined understanding [1],

[1] This is corroborated by the ludicrous epitaph which Wood has inserted in his Oxon. Athen. vol. iii. col. 876, edit. by Bliss, "which," says he, "was made upon the *voluminous* Prynne," when he died, in 1669.

> Here lies the corpse of William Prynne,
> A bencher late of Lincoln's-Inn,
> Who restless ran through thick and thin.

was to suffer for his seditious and dogmatical folly. Whitelocke most appropriately terms him, "busy Mr. Prin." His enormous quarto of more than a thousand pages was accordingly investigated by Heylin, who was no friend to Prynne, though the latter asserts that Heylin produced passages not warranted by his book; but, as Wood remarks, "those two gentlemen were well matched." Heylin delivered the result of his investigation to Sir John Cook and to Laud, who was then Bishop of London; and Noy, the Attorney-General was instructed by Laud to commence a prosecution [1].

Prynne's volume is indeed a literary curiosity; and,

> This grand scripturunt paper-spiller,
> This endless, needless, margin filler,
> Was strangely tossed from post to pillar.
>
> His brains' career was never stopping,
> But pen with rheume of gall still dropping,
> Till hand o'er head brought ears to cropping.
>
> Nor would he surcease such themes,
> But prostitute new virgin reams
> To types of his fanatic dreams.
>
> But while he this hot humour hugs,
> And for more length of tedder tugs,
> Death fang'd the remnant of his lugs.

I may remark, as a specimen of Prynne's literary insanity, that he quotes above a hundred authors to prove the "unloveliness of love-locks."

[1] Wood says, that Laud "did soon after, on a Sunday morning, go to William Noy, the Attorney-General, and charged him to prosecute Prynne for the said booke." Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 146.

though it was dangerous in that age of enthusiasm, yet, perhaps, the punishment exceeded the offence of this remarkable political fanatic. It is a work of great learning, there being upwards of a thousand authors quoted: but it is destitute of judgment; and these authors are classed together without the slightest attempt at arrangement. "Prynne," says a popular modern writer, "scarcely ventures on the most trivial opinion, without calling to his aid whatever had been said in all nations and in all ages; and Cicero and Master Stubbs, Petrarch and Minutius Felix, Isaiah and Froissart's Chronicle, oddly associate in the ravings of erudition [1]." It appears, from the deposition of Dr. Goode, a licenser, at the trial, that this ponderous volume consisted originally of a single quire of paper; and Dr. Harris, another licenser, deposed, that seven years before, Prynne came to him to get a treatise on stage-plays licensed, which he (Dr. Harris) refused. It was then "young and tender," but "it is grown seven times bigger, and seven times worse." It occupied the author seven years, and it was four years in the press. It was licensed by Buckner, chaplain to Archbishop Abbot, for which he also was prosecuted at the trial. It is probable, however, that Prynne had practised a little of his craftiness on the chaplain, by withholding part of the manuscript, or by other methods, by which he wearied

[1] D'Israeli's Calamities of Authors, vol. ii. p. 113, under the division, "A Voluminous Author, without judgment."

the licenser's patience: for Buckner positively declared that he had only licensed "part of the book," and when he heard that it was published, "he endeavoured to suppress it;"—"he approved of the Church," he said, "without any scruple, and of all the ceremonies of the Church of England: and for those censures against ecclesiastical persons in this book, he doth, and ever did, abhor and detest them[1]." The bookseller, Michael Sparkes, a well known publisher of Puritan sedition and rhapsody, who was also prosecuted, declared that it had cost him 300*l.* but it was proved that he had said, "that it was an excellent book, which would be called in, and then sell well[2];" and that he and Prynne had cozened Dr. Buckner to licence the book, or at least sixty-four pages[3].

Prynne had been refused bail, and he accordingly lay in the Tower from Feb. 1, 1632-3, to Feb. 17, 1633-4, when he was brought before the Star-Chamber, after he had been condemned by the members of the Inns of Court, who, to shew their contempt for his fanaticism, invited the King and Queen to a grand masque, as already noticed; which, besides being intended for this purpose, was also a congratulation to the King on his return from Scotland, and for the birth of a prince, afterwards James II. whom Laud baptized at St. James', on the 24th of November. Laud had by this time

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. p. 323. [2] Ibid. p. 234.
[3] Ibid. p. 233.

been raised to the metropolitan See. Noy, the Attorney General, was the prosecutor; Atkins, Holborn, and Herne, were counsel for Prynne.

The speech of Noy is a specimen of the contents of the Histrio Mastyx. "Finding the Church," says the Attorney General, "so deeply wounded by Mr. Prynne, I do leave her to avenge herself of him, and to inflict such punishment on him as he deserves. There are divers particulars wherewith he is not charged within the information by way of crime, and so it is not proper now to bring him unto question for them, as, for mentioning of ceremonies, the discipline of the Church, the complaint of newly-erected altars. I wonder what altars he means: I hope the Church will examine him in due time, as also what he means by his modern innovations in the Church, and by cringing and ducking to altars, a fit term to bestow upon the Church. He learned it of the Canters, being used among them. As for the music in the Church, the charitable terms he giveth it are, not to be a noise of men, but rather a *bleating of brute beasts, choristers bellow the tenor, as it were oxen,* bark a counter-point, as a kennel of dogs, roar out a treble, like a sort of bulls; grunt out a bass, as it were a number of hogs. Bishops he terms silk and satin divines. Christmas is the *Devil's Christmas;* he enters into an argument to induce men to become Puritans, and asserts, in his Index, that *Christ himself was a Puritan*[1]!"

[1] Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 233, 234.

The Judges delivered their opinions with great severity on the unfortunate Prynne. Lord Cottington declared, that in the writing of this book, the devil had either assisted him, or he the devil. "Shall not all who hear these things," said his Lordship, "think that it is the mercy of the King that Mr. Prynne is not destroyed? Have we not seen men lately condemned to be hanged and quartered for far less matters?" Judge Richardson declared, that "if he (Prynne) had been turned over to his tribunal, he must have been left to a jury, from whom no mercy could be hoped for so great an offence." Secretary Cooke, however, delivered the most temperate speech. He pointed out all the absurd erudition of the book. "By this vast book of Mr. Prynne's, it appeareth he hath read more than he hath studied, and studied more than he hath considered; whereas, if he had read but one sentence of Solomon, it had saved him from the danger into which he is likely to fall. There is a good spirit that is meek, tempered with modesty and humility, with mildness and equity; and such a spirit is always tender not to destroy, root up, and overthrow, but to bind, repair, and preserve. But there is another fiery spirit, which is always vomiting fire, nothing but damnation and destruction; certainly, such a spirit ever tends to its own confusion. And, if this be well observed, every man shall find it true, that such a spirit ever cometh before destruction. I think if Mr. Prynne had been asked the question that Naaman did to the

prophet, he would not at all have bid, *Go in peace;* he would have threatened hell and destruction. I am very sorry he hath so carried himself, that a man may justly fear he is the Timon that hath a quarrel against mankind. But I love not too much to aggravate offences, which of themselves are heavy enough. He calleth his book Histrio Mastyx, but therein he sheweth himself like unto Ajax, an Anthropomastix, as the Grecians called him, the scourge of all mankind; the whipper, and the whip [1]."

The Lords were, perhaps, stimulated more by passion than reason in their sentence of Prynne. He was condemned to pay a fine of 5000*l.* to the King, to be expelled from the University of Oxford, and also Lincoln's Inn; to be for ever degraded or disabled from his profession at the bar; to stand in the pillory, first at Palace Yard, Westminster, and three days after at Cheapside, in each place to lose an ear: to have his book burnt before his face by the common executioner; and to be a prisoner for life. His case occupied the Lords three days, and on the third day they did not end their deliberations till three in the afternoon [2], a proof, at least, that his case was fairly investigated, and his counsel fully heard in mitigation. Buckner, the licenser, was sentenced to be severely admonished, to be

[1] Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 231—238, &c.

[2] Wentworth's State Papers, Garrard to Wentworth, Feb. 27, 1633, vol. i. p. 207.

subjected to a temporary imprisonment, and to pay a fine of 50*l.* Sparkes, the publisher, was fined 500*l.* and condemned to stand in the pillory, with a paper prefixed, declaring his offence [1].

The sentence of Prynne was recorded in February, and it was executed on the following May, 1634. The Histrio Mastyx was burnt under his nose, till it almost suffocated him: in Palace Yard and Cheapside his ears were cropt, but he lost only a very small portion of them; for this part of the sentence was almost remitted in the execution [2]; on the 29th of April he was expelled from the University [3], and he was conducted back to prison, to suffer perpetual imprisonment.

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. 234.

[2] Wood's Athen. Oxon, vol. iii. col. 846. This leniency occasioned a report to be spread among his friends (for Prynne willingly gave out that he had lost his ears,) that his ears had grown again to his head, (Garrard to Wentworth, June 20, 1634,) which was eagerly believed by the Puritan faction, who, indeed, believed any thing. The truth is, that this part of the sentence was hardly inflicted, but his books were so highly valued by the enthusiasts, that a lady, who died shortly after the sentence, bequeathed a legacy to Sion College, to purchase books, and enjoined that Prynne's Works should be first bought. Garrard to Wentworth, as above. Lord Dorset's Speech, apud Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 241.

[3] In a Convocation held on the 29th of April. It is a singular fact, that Prynne destroyed the form of his degradation by the University, by tearing out the leaves from the accounts of the Convocation, which contained the record, when that book and the Register were transmitted to the Long Parliament to be ransacked for charges against the Archbishop. The beginning

In these punishments we must not forget the customs of the age. Although we should revolt in the present day at the practice, even in the case of the vilest criminal, yet it was then a customary punishment to cut off the ears and to slit the nose. On the same principle, numbers of deranged old women were burnt as witches in that century, especially in Scotland, and for practices, which at present, perhaps, would hardly procure them a few hours in the stocks. When the conduct of this political fanatic is considered, who was dignified by his party with the title of *William the Conqueror*, and whose firmness and obstinacy, it is said, induced the King himself to bestow upon him the title of the *Cato of his Age*—when it is recollected that he became a most violent incendiary, an implacable enemy to the government, whether civil or ecclesiastical,—that he was the idol of the rabble, and

and the end of the entry still remains, however, though it is scored and deciphered. It is as follows: "Convocatione habita 29 Aprilis An. D'ni 1634, cujus causa erat (sic enim præfabatur Vicecancel.) ut egregius ille Histrio-Mastyx prœlii stupor et idolum vulgi Gulielmus Prinne, e Camera Stellata justissimo fulmine percussus, gradu Academico quem infamavit exueretur. Dum enim non tantum in fabulas, sed in res et personas——— in candidissimos principum mores, in bonos et literatos pene singulos (tanquam mundus totus ageret histrionem) iisdem furiis debacchatus est, ipse tandem factus est fabula, cujus actus primus a degradatione incipit infeliciorem postea habitura catastrophen. Quanam vero nobis in piaculari hac victima mactanda partis relictæ sint, ex decreto Curiæ ad nos transmisso intelligetis." Vide Gutch's Oxford, vol ii. part i. p. 393—595.

"eager for any thing that was put into his head," —in short, when it is recollected, that his Histrio Mastyx was a violent, abusive, and indelicate attack on the nation at large, always excepting the zealots who abetted his phrensy, the sentence for these libels, since his ears were hardly touched, was not remarkably severe, although it excited the turbulence of the rabble, with whom Prynne was popular to excess. It is a curious fact, that this indefatigable scribbler recanted the opinions advanced in the Mastyx before he died. In 1649, a work appeared in 4to. entitled, "Mr. William Prynne his Defence of Stage Plays, or a Retraction of a former book of his called Histrio Mastyx." This provoked a reply from one of his opponents, entitled, "Prynne against Prynne;" but our Mastyx was always on the alert, for in the same year he published, "Prynne the Member reconciled to Prynne the Barrister, an Answer to a Pamphlet entitled Prynne against Prynne," 1649.

Prynne, being conducted back to prison, was closely confined, and denied the use of writing materials; which, indeed, from his excessive inclination for scribbling, he seems to have considered a greater punishment than the loss of his ears. This he especially notices in the detail of his grievances, which he supposed proceeded from Archbishop Laud. "Point out," says he, "that the prohibiting of me pens, ink, paper, and books, is not against all law;" and he enters into a lengthened argument to prove, that the abuse of any thing is no sufficient

reason to withhold it. Having procured these, however, he straightway composed a libellous letter, which he dispatched to Archbishop Laud, in which, after many fulminations, he charged the primate as the cause of his troubles. On the 11th of June, Laud received this letter, which abounded with numerous misrepresentations; for the Archbishop had acted only as an individual member of the court, and, indeed, had not sustained such a share in its proceedings[1] as the Earl of Dorset, Lord Cottington, and Judge Richardson, nor could he have much influence with the two latter, as there was then a variance between him and them. On the 26th, Laud shewed the letter to the King, who commanded him to refer it to Noy, the Attorney General. Prynne was accordingly ordered from prison, and brought before Noy; but he seems to have been by this time aware of his rashness, and he resolved to practise some of his knavery. Noy asked him if the letter was in his hand-writing, or if he admitted that he was the author. Prynne cunningly replied, that he could not answer that question, unless he saw the letter, and read the same. Noy, willing to give him an opportunity to escape another punishment, the letter being a gross libel, and, probably, instructed to that effect by the Archbishop, who could easily have prosecuted him had he pleased, but whose chief motive was to silence him, and to shew him his danger, put the letter

[1] Diary, p. 50. Wood, Athen. vol. iii. cols. 846, 847.

into his hands, and turned his back. Prynne instantly tore the letter, and threw the pieces over a window, saying, that it should never rise up in judgment against him. Noy immediately acquainted the court with Prynne's conduct; but this ingenuity saved him a prosecution. Noy had taken a copy of the letter, but it could not be received as legal proof, there being no other evidence for the misdemeanor but the original. For this, however, Prynne was brought into the Star Chamber; "where all this," says Laud, "appeared with shame enough to him." The Archbishop, pitying his extravagances, desisted from all farther proceedings, not wishing to be too severe. "I there," says Laud, "forgave him." But this lenity was of little avail to Prynne, whose calumniating pen was again to procure for him punishment, with other two political fanatics, Burton and Bastwick, whose conduct will be noticed in another place.

At the beginning of the year 1634, Archbishop Laud resolved upon his first metropolitan visitation, the proceedings of which were the same as those of the following year. He had some suspicions, we are informed, of Brent, his Vicar-General, and he therefore associated with him Dr. Heylin, as a joint commissioner. But having become satisfied that Brent was attached to the Church in sincerity, he entrusted him alone with the visitation. The Archbishop's suspicions of this person were, however, well founded, when he saw him act as an evidence against him. In this visitation, cognizance was taken of the

churches of the Diocese, and especially of the communion table. It had received that name, instead of altar, at the Reformation, as, from the mode adopted by the Papists in the celebration of their worship, the people might perhaps be led to conclude that there was little difference between the idolatry of the Popish Mass and the Holy Communion of the Church. But the words *table* and *altar*, although perhaps necessary to be distinguished when superstitious associations were powerful, are arbitrary words, and, in some cases, are synonymous. Bishop Ridley, in 1550, seeing that disputes were likely to arise amongst the ignorant, which, as the first indications of Puritan fanaticism, began early to appear, issued an injunction, in which he ordered the communion table or altar to be removed from the east end, the place which primitive antiquity had invariably assigned to it, to the chancel of the church, and he exhorted "the curates, churchwardens, and questmen, to erect and set up the Lord's Board, after the form of an *honest table*, decently covered, in such place of the choir or chancel as shall be thought most meet by their discretion and agreement, so that the ministers with the communicants may have their places separated from the rest of the people." This simple mode, which militates against the Presbyterian fashion of having moveable tables, was nevertheless disregarded when the enthusiasm began to spread. It has been justly observed, that a contempt for the temples consecrated to divine service, and of those things which are employed in

that sacred service, in many cases induces a contempt for the great object of universal reverence; and, under the Christian dispensation, an affected stoicism with respect to those outward signs which set forth man's salvation, is an indication rather of obstinate pride, than of a desire for primitive simplicity. On the same principle, the man who can employ the Christian temple for profane purposes, who feels no emotions when he enters it as erected for the public worship of his Maker, who can use for carnal or selfish ends those peculiar objects which it contains, without any feeling that his rashness is deserving of the punishment of heaven; such a man, be he Puritan, Presbyterian, Quaker, or sectarian of any description, has yet to learn the first principles of religion; and, perhaps, when his reason triumphs over his enthusiasm, he will find that the practices of neither Puritanism, Presbyterianism, Quakerism, nor any other modern schism, are defensible upon any principles of genuine religion; and this also will he discover, that an affected dislike to every primitive custom is no proof of orthodoxy, but rather an evidence that reason is obscured by ignorance or fanatical zeal. For does it not frequently happen, that when men leave the church of their fathers, enticed by schismatical novelties, no limits can be placed to their wild enthusiasm, and they are speedily beyond the reach of argument and reason? And, as in practical religion, they who "run well for a season," do frequently "draw back unto perdition," and make "shipwreck of faith, and of a

good conscience," so in religion generally, and the Church in particular, they whose minds are captivated by novelties, whether in doctrine or polity, are those in whom error is inveterate, and prejudice incurable.

Much has been said, by those who affect to be liberal, on Archbishop Laud's conduct concerning the external ceremonies of the Church, and to meet all their objections would require an extended discussion, which at present is impossible. But I am prepared to shew, that his orders with respect to the communion table were not only wise and salutary, but highly necessary for the purposes of devotion; for, not to speak now of the authority which he had from the apostolic and primitive Church, nothing is more evident than this, that, if there be no excitements to devotion, and no regard paid to the place where the holy mysteries of our faith are administered, from the nature of the human constitution, a philosophical religion must ensue, as fatal in its effects as superstition; and the plain and palpable doctrine, that the holy sacraments are the means of conferring grace, is supplanted by the schismatical notion, that they are mere rites of commemoration. Let the candid reader only reflect: When Archbishop Laud made his primary and second visitations, he found the churches and the communion table grossly desécrated and profaned, in consequence of that laxity of government, and that encouragement to the notions of Puritanism, which Abbot's unhappy primacy had extensively generated. On the communion tables

the church-wardens kept their accounts, and employed them for the transaction of parish business; school-boys were taught to read and write upon them, and deposited upon them their hats and books; during sermon they were employed as seats; dogs defiled them; those who happened to be repairing the church would drive them full of nails; nay, such were the habitual carelessness and irreverence of those concerned, that in one place a dog actually seized and made off with the whole of the sacramental bread, and in other places, the wine had been brought to the holy table in pint pots and bottles [1], and this was defended by the Puritans, by their superstitious argument of spiritual worship. Never, perhaps, was there a more lamentable representation of the Temple of Jerusalem in the days of our divine Saviour, than in the wretched times of which I now write, when, in many cases, God's house, instead of being a "house of prayer," became literally "a den of thieves."

Bishop Williams of Lincoln had at first, "when he was in good humour," as Heylin expresses it, taken due cognizance of these matters, and had made very material alterations in St. Martin's, Leicester; and the altar of his own chapel was more splendidly decorated than many in the kingdom. But, being now determined to oppose Laud by every expedient, he, on the 13th of December, 1633, thought proper to abrogate this in a particular in-

[1] Heylin, p. 269. 272.

stance, whereby he directly encouraged those acts of profaneness. Fortunately, however, Laud was metropolitan, and Williams one of his suffragans, so that the former was possessed of a power which enabled him to rectify abuses. Williams' conduct was certified to Laud, and, accordingly, in his visitation, he suspended the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Lincoln during its continuance. The Bishop opposed this act, which appeared to him an unwarrantable assumption of power; and in a letter to the Archbishop, he writes, that, in examining the records of several registers, he found that his diocese had never been visited since 1285, during the episcopate of Dr. Robert Grosthead, and never afterwards, but by a bull from the Pope, or, since the Reformation, by a letter of assistance from the King, because the revenues of the bishopric had been seized by the Duke of Somerset in the reign of Edward VI., and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction being re-modelled, his fees, arising thence, were his chief support; moreover, this metropolitan visitation would be much more grievous to him, as it was the year of his own triennial visitation. Archbishop Laud replied, that he would not do him injustice, but that he was resolved to assert his own metropolitan rights. It was agreed to refer the matter to the Attorney-General, who decided in favour of the primate, and Laud produced sufficient proofs that his procedure was according to ancient metropolitan law. The objections of the bishop, however, were heard by the Privy Council, and were

proved to be groundless; the Vicar-General proceeded in his visitation, which was more vexatious to Williams, because his old enemy Sir John Lamb, now Dean of the Arches, presided, and endeavoured, as far as possible, to enjoin the commands of the Church, leaving the Bishop to see that these injunctions were observed. But no sooner had the Vicar-General removed into another diocese, than Williams proceeded to visit his own diocese in person, bestowing especial marks of favour towards those who were of the Puritan faction. "Insomuch," says Heylin, who relates the above facts at length, "that meeting in the archdeaconry of Buckingham with one Dr. Bret, a very grave and reverend man, but one who was supposed to be inclined that way, he embraced him with these words of St. Augustine, 'Quamvis Episcopus major est Presbytero, Augustinus tamen minor est Hieronymo[1].'"

[1] Heylin, p. 269, 270, 271. The circumstances of this visitation excited Williams to publish his "Letters to the Vicar of Grantham," which he had written in 1627, though at first he did not intend to publish them. They were answered by Dr. Heylin, in a work entitled, "A Coal from the Altar." To this the Bishop replied, in his "Holy Table, name and thing, more anciently, properly, and literally used under the New Testament, than that of Altar, written long ago by a Minister in Lincolnshire, in answer to Dr. Coal, a judicious Divine in Queen Marie's days. Printed for the use of the Diocese of Lincoln," 1637. 4to. Dr. Heylin answered this in his *Antidotum Lincolinense*, which the Bishop intended to review, but was prevented by his misfortunes.

It may be here remarked, that all the Archbishop required them to do in his visitations was, to remove the table to the eastern extremity of the church, to elevate it a little above the level of the pavement, and to rail it in, to protect it from profanation. He proceeded on this fundamental principle, that there should be a difference between the placing of the communion table in the church, and the disposal of a man's table in his own house: having, moreover, the law on his side, as set forth by the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, that the table should be where the altar formerly stood. No reasonable man will object to these regulations. Even supposing that he is puritanically inclined, if he be a sincere worshipper, the communion service will not be the less efficacious because it is towards the east; and in opposing it he is equally dogmatical; as if indeed there could be no right communion unless it were in the middle of the church. The elevation of the place where the table stands is of little consequence, and the arguments against it are lame and objectionable. Prosecutions, no doubt, followed, against those who refused compliance, and it is admitted, that in some instances they were severe; but it must not be forgotten that this severity originated from the obstinacy of the parties in fault. If they were so violently opposed to the Church, why did they not leave it? No man is compelled to remain in any religious communion: Christianity, or rather the Church, is a voluntary association; but he who enters it pledges himself to con-

form to its regulations. Was it to be expected that the Church should resign the customs of antiquity, which the Puritans themselves acknowledged were not essential to salvation, to gratify the fancies of a few, who obstinately persisted in attaching themselves to its communion, while, at the same time, they were undermining its constitution? The integrity of such persons may be justly questioned. At least, the law of the Church is not to be changed at will, nor is it to become subservient to the prejudices of a few, who knew that law before they received its ordination—who pledged themselves that they would obey their rulers, and who, being rational men, were expected to be guided by their reason in their adherence to, or choice of, the Church of England, as resulting from a conviction of its apostolical constitution. Let not these remarks be misconstrued. Should the argument be turned against me on the conduct of the Reformers in departing from the Church of Rome, whose valid ordination they had received, I beg it to be understood, that I am not here alluding to doctrines, but to things which are acknowledged to be absolutely not essential to salvation; yet even the Reformers abandoned the Popish Church not so much for its doctrines, as they agreed with it in fundamentals, as for the abuse of those doctrines by crafty subtleties and cunning inventions. Archbishop Laud, it may be safely alleged, acted in no way which he was not warranted to do by Scripture and the practice of the primitive Church.

In the visitation which the Archbishop performed by his Vicar-General, Sir Nathaniel Brent, the French and Dutch congregations were taken under his cognizance, and those members of them who were born in England were enjoined to attend the parish churches, being English subjects, while those who were foreigners, whether ministers or laymen, were enjoined to use the liturgy translated into their respective languages. But among them, also, perverseness had its influence, and many of them rather than comply quitted the kingdom. Now, though such an interference would be injudicious in the present day, it was not so in the reign of Charles I. Those congregations were only tolerated by the Government, though they consisted of foreigners; and it was at least possible, that from them might emanate that Calvinistic spirit of faction, to which the Puritans were so prone, as those congregations were erected on "Calvin's model." By Laud's vigorous exertions, the foreign chaplaincies had been at length brought under the jurisdiction of the Church, so that foreigners would no longer in derision inquire, what religion the English professed, since they had found in one factory, or military chaplaincy, Calvinism; in another, Independency; in a third, Anabaptism; in a fourth, Doctrinal Puritanism, and every fashionable sect; all professing themselves to be of the Church of England, while the conscientious ministers of the Church were few in number. But in England the foreign congregations stood aloof and dismembered from the Church, which was essentially

Protestant; their condition, therefore, was very different from that of the English congregations abroad, which were some of them in Roman Catholic countries, and all of them attached to factories or embassies, whereas those in England were not in that situation, their members having established themselves on this side of the channel under no patronage, and solely for their own aggrandizement. Here, then, was an open encouragement to Puritanism. If those congregations of *native foreigners* were of the Protestant faith, why not of the Church of England; and if they used a liturgy, as they professed to do, why not the liturgy of the Church? But if they were not of the Church, then unquestionably some account was to be taken of them, and if the opinions they inculcated were in opposition to it, they could not expect a greater toleration than the Papists; their opinions, perhaps, being not less dangerous and pernicious.

In Archbishop Laud's conduct, then, there was both reason and prudence. We must not confound the practice of the nineteenth century with that of the seventeenth, nor judge of the latter by the former. It is needless to mince the matter: it was enforcing *a test*—it was insisting on conformity; and yet I find an author, whose party is by no means remarkably attached to the Church, and who has affected a wondrous zeal for what that party terms "civil and religious liberty all over the world," confessing, that, in certain circumstances, not only ought the press to be restrained, lest it disseminate fanaticism

and sedition, but also that tests are at times necessary for the peace of society[1]. Although he has contradicted this admission frequently in his discussions, yet he has admitted what I now state, that at no period were these more necessary than in the reign of Charles I. The case, therefore, is obvious. Those foreigners might have inculcated opinions directly contrary to the state, civil and ecclesiastical; and yet, if cognizance was taken of them, they might have cried out, "Liberty of conscience, we are foreigners, it is the faith of our country." Were there sufficient reasons to prevent the Church from keeping a watchful eye over them, or would the Puritan have been satisfied if the same excuses had been made in his conventicle? Or, were the King of England to be denounced as a heretic by a congregation of foreign Papists established here, would it be an exculpation that this is the notion of the Popish Church? Or, were opinions subversive of the Church from whom they enjoy protection, to be publicly taught in a foreign Protestant congregation, are they beyond the reach of law because they are foreigners? or are foreigners, like the ancient Israelites, entitled to do that which is right in their own eyes? If foreigners were not pleased with the terms by which they were to be protected, why did they come to this country at all, or why did they not take their departure?

The enthusiasm of the times, however, which re-

[1] Hallam's Constitutional History of England, 4to. vol. ii.

quired to be especially restrained, induced the Archbishop to make certain inquiries respecting these congregations; and accordingly, before his first metropolitan year had ended, he proposed to them some queries, which they were expected to answer. "1. What liturgy they used? whether it was the French or Dutch? 2. How many of them had been born within the realm? and 3. Whether those who were subjects by birth would conform to the Church of England?" These questions were proposed to the foreign congregations at Canterbury, Sandwich, and Maidstone, on the 14th of April 1634, and they were allowed to the 5th of May to prepare their answers. At the time appointed, after producing a list of exemptions, they intended to report that they used that liturgy which the French Reformed Church both in France and Holland had used since the Reformation, and which they had used for sixty or seventy years, since their first settlement; that they did not use the French translation of the English liturgy; and that they knew not whether it was translated into Dutch. About a third part, they alleged, of the heads of families were natives, the others having arrived within a few years; and they begged to be excused from answering the third question, since it would disunite their churches, and render burdensome their maintenance of the poor. On consulting, however, with their adherents in London, they resolved not to present these answers, but claimed exemptions by the protections granted in the reigns of Edward VI., Elizabeth, and King James.

This was mere evasion, for the foreign congregation to which Edward VI. had granted a protection when governed by Alascus, had departed on the death of that prince; and none of the foreign congregations then existing could pretend to be the same, or that the protection extended to persons not only *in esse*, but *in posse*. They could not, therefore, plead, that they were exempted from archiepiscopal jurisdiction, because they had no authentic original charter on which they rested their exemptions. On these grounds Laud enjoined, that all members of the foreign congregations, who were natives born, should attend their parish churches, —and that those who were not natives should use the Liturgy of the Church translated into their own language. This order was issued on the 19th December, and on the 15th of March, 1634-5, they were expected to conform. In the interval, however, they assembled a Synod in London, and resolved to address the Archbishop. They accordingly laid before him their reasons of dissent, which having been duly considered, received this reply: "That he had resolved to make a general visitation of his province, and that he would begin at home—that he did nothing without the consent of the King and Council—that the letters patent of Edward VI. were no proofs—that their churches were nurseries for schism, which it was his duty to prevent—that it were better there were no foreigners in England, than that the Church should be endangered—that they endeavoured to exalt

themselves as a state within a state, and had boasted that they feared not his injunctions,—that he governed solely by the canons, and, as long as he did so, the King would maintain him in his authority—that their congregations, and the silence of two or three preachers, were not to be balanced with the peace and happiness of the Church of England—that their ignorance of the English language was no excuse, as they knew it very well to transact their ordinary business—and that he was resolved they should comply with his injunctions at the appointed time[1]."

They had recourse to various methods to avoid this injunction, and a petition was forthwith got up to be presented to the King; the petitioners, in the mean time, exerting themselves as much as possible to procure influence at court. But when this petition was examined, it was found to contain nothing satisfactory; neither did they condescend to specify the peculiar discipline of their churches, resting chiefly on their alleged grounds of exemption. The King, therefore, insisted on the first injunction; and the Archbishop qualified the second, by ordering that those who were foreigners by birth should still attend their own peculiar worship. This temperate measure, however, was by no means satisfactory, and the French congregation in Canterbury stimulated the Mayor of that city to use his

[1] Heylin, p. 260—264. Troubles and Trials, p. 165. 374. Neal, vol. ii. p. 269.

exertions with the Archbishop, that, as in all probability the foreigners would depart, great inconvenience would result from an additional number of paupers being thrown on the city, which they had hitherto supported. Finally, they practised so well by delays, that, in 1635, they obtained an additional proviso, that the foreigners should contribute to the support of their ministers, and the maintenance of their poor,—and that a protection, if they desired it, would be obtained from the King, against all who should molest them in their manufactures[1].

The Bishop of Norwich vigorously enforced his metropolitan's injunctions, but we have only the authority of Roger Coke, a violent Puritan, for the assertion, that by them *many thousands* of families were frightened, and induced to emigrate to New England, to the ruin of the trade of Ipswich and other places. Certain it is, that the Puritan faction secretly abetted the turbulent foreigners, who seem not to have comprehended the Archbishop's intentions, and whose obstinacy afforded considerable grounds for suspicion. So unsettled, however, were the people, and so much had the leaven of Puritanism increased their opposition, that all the wise designs of Laud were in many cases frustrated by the remissness of those who managed the parochial matters. If the foreign congregations were eventually broken up, it was

[1] Heylin, p. 264, 265. Echard, vol. ii. p. 114.

not so much the fault of Laud as of themselves; and one thing at least is certain, that they did not depart from the kingdom, until they had been enriched by successful trading. The grand design of the Archbishop was peace and unity; he wished to see the Church strengthened against all its enemies, whether Papists or sectaries; and in order to effect this, he allowed the clergy the utmost latitude of interpretation, that is, he insisted not, like the Puritans, that they should preach certain doctrines, and adopt a certain phraseology, but, as long as they held fast the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, all he required was conformity to discipline. It was otherwise with the Puritans; those who did not preach predestination were denounced as Papists and Atheists: toleration formed no part of their creed; their champion Abbot had declared against it; they themselves had often opposed it, and like their brethren, the Scotch Covenanters, they declared it "a hideous monster." Yet, even for political reasons, Laud was completely justifiable in his conduct towards those foreign sectaries in that age of fermentation: and, though it was afterwards alleged against him as a crime, because he had, according to the veracity of his accusers, "traitorously endeavoured to cause division and discord between the Church of England and other reformed churches, and to that end hath suppressed and abrogated the privileges and immunities, which had been by his Majesty and his royal ancestors granted to the French and Dutch churches in this

kingdom," yet, had not the minds of his enemies been miserably perverted, it appears to me, that the satisfactory answer which Laud gave to this charge was completely conclusive on the subject. With scorn he repelled the accusation, that he had endeavoured to create such an invidious division: had he done so, he said, it would have been an unchristian and unworthy act; but, even admitting it, he denied that it was treason, as his accusers alleged. He proved that those foreigners had not used their privileges in a becoming manner; and the reasons he assigned for his conduct were the most cogent and satisfactory. "1. Thus living as they did," says he, "and standing so strictly to their own discipline, wrought upon the party in England which were addicted to them, and made them more averse than otherwise they would have been, to the present government of the Church of England. 2. That by this means they lived in England, as if they were a kind of God's Israel in Egypt, to the great dishonour of the Church of England, to which at first they fled for shelter against persecution. And in that time of their danger, the Church of England was in their esteem not only a true but a glorious Church; but by this favour which their church received, it grew up, and encroached upon us, till it became a Church within a Church, and a kind of state within a state. And this I ever held dangerous, how small soever might be the beginning. 3. That they live here, and enjoy all freedom, and yet for the most part scorn to learn the

language, or to converse with any, save for the advantage of bargaining: and will take no Englishman to be their apprentice, nor teach their manufactures, which I did then, and do still think, unreasonable. 4. That for religion, if, after so many descents of their children born in the land, and therefore native subjects, these children of theirs should refuse to pray and communicate with the Church of England, into whose bosom their parents fled at first for succour, I thought then, and do still think, that no state could with safety or in wisdom endure it. And this concerning their children was all that was desired by me[1]." It is, moreover, a remarkable fact, that though the diocese of Norwich, according to Roger Coke and other Puritan enthusiasts, was the scene where many severities were practised, the Archbishop actually received a letter dated 14th of September, 1635, from the ministers and elders of the French and Dutch churches in the city of Norwich, thanking him for the conduct he had displayed in all those proceedings, which letter the Archbishop declared he had in his own possession[2].

But those who condemn Laud for his discipline and love of order, either through their spurious liberality, or their limited comprehensions, lose sight of the grand object he had in view. This was no other than to make the Protestantism of the

[1] History of Troubles and Trials, p. 165, 166.

[2] Archdeacon Echard's History, vol. i. p. 114.

Church of England completely to supplant the Popish superstition: in truth, it was his design, whether visionary or not, I will not say, but at least desirable, to pave the way for the fall of Popery, by erecting on its ruins the Catholic Episcopacy of England. We are informed, "that it was hoped there would be a Church of England in all the courts of Christendom, in the chief cities of the great Mahometan princes, and in all the known parts of the world, by which it might become as diffused and catholic as the Church of Rome;" and "he had considerable success in this design." Nor was this the result of a spirit of proselytism, for Laud was not the man to stoop beneath his dignity as a Protestant Bishop, even for the advancement of the Church to which he was zealously attached; but it resulted from his love of the doctrines of the Protestant Reformation, in the dissemination of which he had employed his talents, his influence, and his personal labours.

The see of Canterbury will never be a sinecure; nor was Laud disposed to take his ease in this important situation. No man better understood the duties of a Christian bishop: he was moved, doubtless, by something of that spirit which induced the Apostle of the Gentiles to exclaim, that he had "the care of all the churches;" nor had Laud, from the day on which he first entered upon an active life, known what it was to enjoy peace in the domestic circle. It was not that he delighted in bustle; but the times were too troublesome, and

he hesitated not as to the conduct which it became him to pursue. This year we find him employed in improving and settling the revenues of the London clergy, which had been heretofore barely sufficient for their maintenance in the metropolis of a great kingdom. When it is considered, that the expences in a large city greatly exceed those of a country benefice,—that in the dense population of city parishes, where there are people of all orders and conditions, the duties are laborious and unceasing, it will readily be conceded, that, especially in such a city as London, the clergy are entitled to greater remuneration than those who are beneficed on a country cure. Moreover, London, having in the days of Laud, as is the case at this time, an important influence on the whole kingdom, the city being the emporium of commerce, trade, and manufactures, and having great influence upon every other city and province, it was necessary that it should be reduced to that conformity which would render it an object of imitation to others. On account of the poverty of the beneficed clergy, they were compelled to do many things derogatory to their dignity; to accept of lectureships, which otherwise they would not have done; to connive at many things, that they might not disoblige their chief parishioners. The lecturers, in the mean time, who were what Dr. Heylin aptly terms them, *creatures of the people*, as must always be the case where a minister is elected by popular suffrage, were assiduous in underrating the labours of the

regular clergy, endeavouring, by mean submission and flattery, to obtain the favour of the wealthy citizens; and besides, these very lectureships were maintained at the expence of the regular clergy, and on the tythes and offerings which had always been their due. It was doubtless right, if the inhabitants of a parish wished to have a lecturer, that there should be one, always making a proviso, that the regular incumbent was not to suffer in his legal revenues; and it was the duty of the bishop first to ascertain whether the proposed lectureship was expedient; secondly, how it was to be maintained; and, thirdly, that the person appointed was well affected towards the Church. But when, setting aside the fact, that those popular lecturers were in general violent Puritans, who hated the Church, not those who were disposed to support it, it was proved that the regular clergy were sufferers by them in every respect, it was time to take into consideration to what purpose the parochial dues were appropriated, and who received the benefit of them,—whether the legal and qualified incumbent, or the upstart favourite of popular election.

It is an established principle, however much it may be clamorously disputed by Dissenters, that popular election must inevitably bring along with it a desire to accommodate itself to the prevailing taste, and on this principle it is easy to account for the numerous sects which have every where sprung up in Protestant countries, and in some places obtained the mastery; for the malecontents, well knowing that

their passions will not be inflamed, nor their enthusiasm gratified, in the Church, by the wildness of declamation and the extravagance of rhetorical harangues, betake themselves to those expedients by which they can be satisfied, and flatter their pride by the power which they assume over the person whom they appoint as their minister. The Church indeed is a gainer by the departure of those discontented men from its pale, but it is not just that it should be a loser in its temporalities by their extravagance: for, although liberty of conscience may be conceded to every man, yet the ecclesiastical constitution is not to be reduced and modified according to the vagaries of every succeeding generation who choose to enter their dissent, not perhaps so much on account of doctrines, as on account of forms which they at the same time acknowledge to be of minor importance. In the primitive, and most certainly in the apostolical, times, there was no such thing as popular election. The apostles, the first bishops of the Church, sent whom they pleased as presbyters to the individual churches, without consulting the people, and this practice was continued in the early ages; and I have all along been convinced, that no man who reads the Acts of the Holy Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul, can advocate the polity, if it may be called so, of Independency. However, without further digression, when the Archbishop set himself to make inquiry respecting the revenues of the London benefices, he found them in a state which well deserved his consideration. In the time

of Henry VIII., the sum of 2*s.* 9*d.* per pound was agreed to be paid by the citizens of London to their clergy, but so many evasions were made, that the clergy in the reign of James I. were compelled to have recourse to the Exchequer, and it was decided by that court that this tythe on houses justly belonged to the benefice. Still the clergy had to contend with the refractory citizens, who being inflamed by Puritanism, were now more obstinate in their opposition. In the petition which they were forced to present this year to the King, they declared, that they were "very poor and mean, many of the benefices not worth 40*l.* per annum, most not 100*l.*, only one, Christ Church, a city impropriation, worth 350*l.*;" and they declared, that they had no means "to discover the true value of their said rents, by the oath of the parties, for many London landlords (to the defeating of the petitioners, and endangering their own souls) had, and did daily continue double leases, or they made provision, by which they called some part of the house rent by the name of rent, and all the rent, which, being paid quarterly, by the name of fine, income, or the like[1]." The case was remitted by the King to the Archbishop, and along with him, to the Lord Keeper Coventry, the Earl Marshal, the Bishop of London, Lord Cottington, Secretary Windebank, and the Chief Justice Richardson, or to any five or three of them, the Archbishop always to be one, to examine into the busi-

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. p. 269.

ness, and to rectify abuses [1]. Little, however, was done till the promotion of Bishop Juxon to the office of Lord Treasurer, when the condition of the clergy was considerably improved; and doubtless the Archbishop would have succeeded in his benevolent intentions had not those troubles commenced, the preludes to future disasters, when the attention of the court was turned to other matters connected with the city of London. Yet the Archbishop's concern in this important business was afterwards one of the *crimes* alleged against him [2]; for this reason, no doubt, that "they who conceived 2000*l.* of yearly rent not enough for an alderman, think 100*l.* per annum, (as was affirmed by one of their number) too much for a minister [3]."

This year, too, the Archbishop, unwearied in his assiduity, did great service to the Irish Church, by obtaining for its clergy from the King, a grant of all the crown impropriations; but on this subject let us hear the old historian:—"At this time miserable was the maintenance of the Irish clergy, where scandalous means made scandalous ministers. And yet, a Popish priest would grow fat in that parish where a Protestant would be famished, who has not a livelihood on the oblations of those of his own religion. But now such impropriations as were in the crown were restored to the Church by the King, to a great diminution of the royal revenue,

[1] Rushworth, ut sup. p. 270—272.

[2] Troubles and Trials, p. 251, 252. [3] Heylin, p. 268.

though his Majesty never was sensible of any loss to himself, if thereby gain might redound to God by his ministers. Bishop Laud was a worthy instrument in moving the King to so pious a work, and yet this his procuring of the Irish, did not satisfy those who were discontented at his opposition of the English impropriations; thus, those conceived to have done hurt at home, will hardly make reparation by other good deeds done at a distance [1]."

On the subject of Ireland, I enter a little into detail, only, however, connected with the Archbishop. That island, famous to this day as the strong-hold of Popish superstition and Popish turbulence, had attracted the attention of the last Parliament, and in the Remonstrance of the House of Commons, it had been specially noticed. "For Ireland," said the King in reply, "we think, in the matter of religion, that it is not worse than Queen Elizabeth left it; and for other affairs, it is as good as we found it, nay, perhaps better; and we take it for a great disparagement of our government that it should be voiced, that new monasteries, nunneries, and other superstitious houses, are erected and replenished in Dublin, and other great towns of the kingdom." The Remonstrance of the Commons, nevertheless, induced Laud to turn his attention towards this kingdom, and accordingly he wrote to Bedell, Bishop elect of Kilmore, to transmit to him a com-

[1] Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 149. Troubles and Trials, p. 297, 298.

plete account of the state of the Church and kingdom. Lord Falkland was then Lord Deputy, and on one occasion, Usher, the primate, and others of the bishops had signed a protestation against the toleration of Popery. Usher being a rigid Calvinist, though in the latter part of his life, as I have remarked, he entertained other sentiments, had done his utmost to introduce the Lambeth Articles into that kingdom. On the first of April 1630, Dr. Bedell returned an answer to Laud's letter, in which he delineated the Romish practices. —"That there was a Popish clergy more numerous by far than the English clergy; that they were in full exercise of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction by their Vicars-General and Officials, who were so confident as to excommunicate those that came to the courts of the Protestant Bishops." In short, that the Protestant Church was in a miserable condition when compared with the Popish, though the former was certainly not worse since the King's Accession.

Laud was not unmindful of the distressed state of Ireland, and the appointment of his friend, Lord Wentworth, as Lord Deputy, enabled him to promote the welfare of that Church. Accordingly, we find Laud, while as yet Bishop of London, thus writing to Wentworth, after his arrival in Ireland: "I heartily and humbly pray you to give me leave to recommend these particulars following, both to your memory and your justice, so soon as it pleases God you shall be settled in Ireland, and that you will be pleased to consider so many particulars as

concern the Church and religion, with as much favour as justice can give way unto you. 1. I humbly pray your Lordship to remember what you have promised me concerning the church at Dublin, which hath for divers years been used for a stable by your predecessors, and to dedicate it to God's service, as you shall there examine and find the merits of the cause." Two other particulars follow relating to private matters, then he adds, "4. That, in the great cause of impropriations, which are yet remaining in his Majesty's gift, and which he is most graciously willing to give back to God, and his service, you will do whatsoever may justly be done for the honour and service of our two great masters, God and the King, that you would countenance and assist the Lord Primate of Armagh, (Usher,) in all things belonging to this great service: and particularly for the procuring of a true and just valuation of them, that the King may know what he gives to that Church. I pray, my Lord, be hearty in this, for I shall think myself very happy, if God be pleased to spare my life to see this business ended." After desiring Wentworth to claim a debt from the Bishop of Waterford, Dr. Michael Boyle, of 35*l.* due by him to St. John's College, Oxford, "as appears by a note under Dr. Juxon's hand, then President of the College," which Laud presumes he will not deny; but, fearing a denial, "I here send your Lordship the bond itself, which he entrusted to the College, according to course, when he was made

Fellow, and two letters which he himself sent to me, while I was President, acknowledging the debt, and demanding forbearance,"—and, after desiring Wentworth that he "will be honourably pleased to receive the College money," he observes, "I further pray your Lordship to take notice by the Lord Primate of Armagh, of the readiness of the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland to set forward the maintenance of the ministers of religion in that kingdom, and to encourage him to advance the same. As also, to move the Lord Chief Justice for his opinion, what legal course he shall think best to be held for the present means of curates out of these impropriations in Ireland[1]."

This is the first letter written by Laud to Wentworth, after the removal of the latter to Ireland, and is dated London, 30th April, 1633; for Laud was then in that see. But, that he had determined to do something in this matter, is evident from "the things which he had projected to do, if God blessed him in them," and which he had recorded in the rude order already before the reader, about the year 1630. One of these things, it will be recollected, was, "to procure King Charles to give all the impropriations yet remaining in the crown within the realm of Ireland to that poor Church," to which, in an after period, he has added, "Done, and settled there." It matters not whether he was

[1] The Bishop of London to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, April 30, 1633. Strafford's Letters, vol. i.

first prompted to this by Archbishop Usher[1]: still the merit of that great service to the Protestant religion belongs to him, restrained as that religion has been since the days of Laud, by the tricks and the cunning of priests and others in Ireland. The correspondence between Laud and Wentworth at this period is most interesting, as from it we at once ascertain the secret feelings of those two great men. Long extracts might perhaps be deemed tedious, and therefore I forbear: but these letters are doubly interesting, because they disclose to us that entire confidence, and union of heart and soul, which are so conspicuous in their intercourse, and which can be ascertained far more easily by this correspondence than by a bare recital of facts.

On the 24th of September, 1633, Laud had been chosen Chancellor of the University of Dublin, and on the 13th of May, 1634, he received the seals of office. This brought the Archbishop into a closer connexion with Ireland, and made him more alive to the interests of the Irish Church, that its "jurisdiction might be maintained," as he observes in the letter to Wentworth, already quoted, "against recusants, and all other factionists whatsoever." On his election to the Chancellorship, the Archbishop thus writes: "As for the College, I am very sorry they have chosen me Chancellor, and if they will follow the directions I have given them by my Lord Primate, I hope they will send me a resignation,

[1] Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 749.

that I may give it over, and your Lordship be chosen, being upon the spot, and able to do them much good. As for their statutes, if they need any revisal, I shall not refuse that pains; but, before I can enter upon that service, if they have a confirmation of their statutes under the Broad Seal of the kingdom, or this, I must have a commission under the same Seal, to authorize me to alter or do what I think proper with them, else I may not interfere. If this shall be thought fit, I will presently send for a copy of their statutes, and such exceptions as the wisest men in that society can make against them, and so proceed[1]." But, although the Archbishop thus expresses a reluctance to accept the office, both on account of his numerous other duties, and from a modest diffidence, that, because he was not on the spot, he would not be able to do the University much good; yet that Society is also indebted to him in no ordinary degree. His proposal for the statutes was carried into effect, and, among his "projected things," we find this one:—"A new charter for the College near Dublin, to be procured of his Majesty, and a new body of statutes made to rectify that government;" to which in an after period he added, "*Done*." Again, in another letter on this subject, he remarks, "Concerning the College at Dublin, since they have made me Chancellor, and your Lordship approves of them in so

[1] Archbishop Laud to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, March 11, 1633.

doing, I will begin to take them to task, and, if I have so much leisure, there comes a letter with them to the College, which I pray command to be delivered." And, in the same letter, after sportively remarking, "By St. Dunstan, if it were not for swearing[1], I see you guess unhappily, that your friends can tell how to be merry as well as serious together, and you shall not need to intreat us to continue it, for we have no other purpose;" the good Primate then adds, "From your mirth, you leap into those directions which at your entreaty I gave, and I am glad you will so soon take order that divine service be read throughout all the churches, be the company that vouchsafe to come never so few. Let God have his whole service with reverence, and he will quickly send more to help to perform it. For the holding of two livings, and but two with cure, since you approve me in the substance, I will yield to you in the circumstance of time. Indeed, my Lord, I knew it was bad, very bad, in Ireland, but that it was so stark naught I did not believe. Six benefices not able to find the minister in cloaths! In six parishes scarce six to come to church! Good God! Stay the time you must, till there be some means, and some more conformable people[2]."

It were easy to multiply extracts from this interesting correspondence, which would more fully

[1] The Archbishop, in this and other letters, ridicules the detestable vice of profane swearing.

[2] Archbishop Laud to the Lord Deputy, May 14, 1634.

evince Laud's care of the Irish Church. Yet one or two must not be omitted. In the Earl of Cork's business about the removal of the monument which that nobleman had set up at the east end of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, and which Wentworth, at Laud's recommendation, had ordered to be removed, the Archbishop writes thus: "Now for your question, what will my Lord of Cork say? I cannot tell: but sure I am, so many of the fraternity as think it Popery to set the communion-table at the end of the chancel, and for the prebends to come in their formalities to church, are either ignorant or factious fools. But I warrant you," continues he, "that I am thought as odd an Archbishop as you can be a Deputy, for my Lady Davies prophesies against me, that I shall not many days outlive the fifth of November." And he then informs Wentworth of the individual who had proclaimed him a traitor, which he has noted in his Diary, and of "another mad fellow, that comes into court with a great sword by his side, and rails upon the Archbishop, God knows for what, and says, He will have justice of the King against me, or take another course for it himself[1]." To this

[1] Archbishop Laud to the Lord Deputy, 15th of November, 1633. Diary, p. 49. Heylin, p. 250, 251. This writer has given the anecdote of Lady Davies at length. "And that the other sex," says he, "might whet their tongues upon him also, Lady Davies, widow of Sir John Davies, Attorney-General for Ireland in King James' reign, scatters a prophecy against him. This lady had before spoken something unlucky against the Duke of Buckingham, importing that he would not live till the

Wentworth, after detailing to the Archbishop the state of the Church, and that "to start aside for such panic fears, or fantastic apparitions, as a Prynne or an Elliot shall set up, were the meanest folly in the whole world:" facetiously adds, "It contents me exceedingly to understand of your Lordship's full health, which may God long continue; and, if sometimes a prophet be not believed in his own country, then such a

end of August, which raised her to the reputation of a cunning woman among the ignorant people: and now she prophesies of the new Archbishop, that he should live but few days after the 5th of November, for which, and other prophecies of a more mischievous nature, she was brought before the High Commission, the woman being so mad, that she fancied the spirit of the prophet Daniel to be infused into her body. And this she grounded on an anagram which she made of her name, viz. *Eleanor Davies—Reveal, O Daniel:* and though the anagram had too much by an *S*, and too little by an *L*, yet she found *Daniel* and *reveal* in it, and that served her turn. Much pains was taken by the Court to dispossess her of this spirit, but all would not do, till Lamb, then Dean of the Arches, shot her through and through with an arrow borrowed from her own quiver: for whilst the Bishop and divines were reasoning on the point with her from Holy Scripture, he took a pen into his hand, and at last hit upon this excellent anagram, *Dame Eleanor Davies, never so mad a lady;* which having been proved by the rules of art, 'Madam,' said he, 'I see you build much on anagrams, and I have found out one which I hope will fit you.' This said, and reading it aloud, he put it into her hands in writing, which happy fancy brought that grave court into such a laughter, and the poor woman thereupon into such a confusion, that afterwards she grew wiser, or was less regarded."

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL
SANDFORD FLEMING LIBRARY

prophetess as the Lady Eleanor shall surely find none but perfect infidels amongst us[1]."

It is enough to observe, however, on the subject of Ireland at present, that in the convocation held at Dublin, the Thirty-nine Articles were received by the Irish Church. Usher, indeed, from his Calvinistic notions, appears to have been reluctant to admit them, preferring rather the Lambeth Articles, and the Archbishop thus writes to Wentworth in anticipation:—"I knew how you would find my Lord Primate affected to the Articles of Ireland, but I am glad the trouble that hath been in it will well end there, without advertising of it over to us. And, whereas you propose to have the Articles of England received in *ipsissimis verbis*, and leave the other as no way concerned, neither affirmed or denied, you are certainly in the right, and so says the King (to whom I imparted it) as well as I. Go, hold fast, and you will do a great service[2]." But Usher, on the whole, appears to have desired this uniformity with the English Church, only fearing that there might be some dispute at the introduction of these Articles. In this Convocation they accordingly declared, that "they received and approved the Book of Articles of Religion, agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops, and the

[1] The Lord Deputy to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dec. 1633.

[2] The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Lord Deputy, Oct. 20, 1634.

whole Clergy, in full convocation holden at London, Anno 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion. And, therefore, if any hereafter shall affirm, that any of those Articles are in any part superstitious and erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated, and not absolved before he makes a public recantation of his error[1]." Nevertheless, though such was the declaration of the Irish Convocation, Usher and the Calvinistic party were not satisfied, but pressed for subscription to the former articles, which breathed the ultra-sublapsarianism of Geneva, along with the articles of the Church of England, which they had received. It required Wentworth's management to prevent disputes, Usher having applied to him for an act of Parliament to ratify the former declaration. "There were some hot spirits," says he, "some of thunder among them, who moved that they should petition me for a free Synod, but, in fine, they could not agree among themselves who should put the bell about the cat's neck, and so this likewise vanished. It is very true, that for all the primate's silence, it was not possible but he knew how near they were to have brought in those Articles of Ireland, to the infinite disturbance and scandal of the Church, as I conceive; and certainly could have been content if I had been surprised. But

[1] Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ii. p. 763. Heylin, p. 257.

he is so learned a prelate, and so good a man, that I do beseech your Grace it may never be imputed to him." And then, anticipating the clamours which the Puritan zealots would make on these proceedings, he adds afterwards, "I am not ignonorant that my stirring herein will be strangely reported and censured, and how I shall be able to sustain myself against your Prynnes, Pyms, and Bens, with the rest of that generation of odd names and natures, the Lord knows. Sure I am, I have gone herein with an upright heart, to prevent a breach, apparent at least, betwixt the Churches of England and Ireland[1]."

It will hardly be credited that the Archbishop's conduct in the affair of impropriations was alleged against him as a heinous crime. But such was the case, and so *well qualified* were religious fanatics to judge on what really constituted a criminal charge. "The first proof alleged," says the Archbishop, "was a passage out of Bishop Montague's Book, *that tithes were due by divine right, and then no impropriations might stand.* And this Prynne witnessed very carefully, that this book was found in my study, and given me by Bishop Montague. And what of this? Doth any Bishop print a book, and not give the Archbishop a copy? Or must I answer for every proposition contained in every book in my library, or that any author gives me?

[1] The Lord Deputy of Ireland to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 16th of December, 1634.

And if Bishop Montague be of opinion, that tithes are due by divine right, what is that to me? They were nibbling at my Diary in this, to shew that *it was one of my projects to fetch in impropriations*, but it was not fit for their purpose. And as to the King's impropriations in Ireland, to the Church there, which Mr. Nicholas, in his gentle language, calls "robbing of the crown," the case was this. The Lord Primate of Armagh wrote unto me, how ill conditioned the state of that Church was for want of resources, and besought me that I would move his Majesty to give the impropriations there, which yet remained in the crown, for the maintenance and encouragement of able ministers to live among the people, and instruct them, assuring me, they were daily one by one begged away by private men, to the great prejudice both of crown and church. I acquainted the King's great officers, the Lord Treasurer, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer with it. And, after long deliberation, the King was pleased, at my humble request, to grant them in the way which I proposed:—which was, that when they came into the hands of the clergy, they should pay all the rents respectively to the King, and some consideration for the several renewals. The truth of this appears in the deeds: so here was no robbing of the crown. For the King had all his set rents received to a penny, and consideration for his casualties beside. And, my Lords, the increase of Popery is complained of in

Ireland. Is there a better way to hinder this growth, than to place able clergy among the inhabitants? Can an able clergy be had without means? Are any means better fitted than impropriations restored? My Lords, I did advance this, as holding it the best way to keep down Popery, and to advance the Protestant religion: and I wish, with all my heart, I had been able to have done it sooner, before so many impropriations were gotten from the crown into private hands[1]."

To this eloquent refutation of their calumnies, a feeble reply was offered by the Archbishop's enemies. But perhaps I have dwelt too long on the subject of the Irish impropriations, though I conceived it better to present the matter to the reader in the Archbishop's own language. On the 5th of February 1634-5, he was appointed a member of the Committee of Trade, and for the improvement of the King's revenue, and on the 14th of March following, he was appointed one of the Commissioners of the Treasury, after the death of Richard Weston, Earl of Portland, Lord High Treasurer, on which occasion the management of the Treasury was, by letters under the Broad Seal, committed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Cottington, Chancellor of the Exchequer; Sir John Cooke, and Sir Francis Windebanke, principal Secretaries of State, and others. Two days afterwards, Archbishop Laud

[1] History of Troubles and Trials, p. 297, 298.

was appointed a member of the Foreign Committee, and to him was committed the sole disposal of ecclesiastical matters [1].

These appointments could not fail to induce political envy towards the Archbishop. He had no great cause to regret the death of the Lord Treasurer, who had, since Buckingham's death, manifested the utmost jealousy at his interest with the King, and had endeavoured to lessen it in various ways. Heylin informs us, that the cause of his being nominated a Commissioner of the Treasury was his vigilance in detecting abuses, for in the year 1631, he had discovered that there was some mismanagement; he perceived that certain individuals had more the aggrandisement of themselves than his Majesty's interest at heart, and that when the King was made acquainted with these abuses, he "did much estrange his countenance from the principal of them," the Lord Treasurer himself. Suspicions fell upon him, that he had discovered their proceedings and given due information, and Weston fostered that secret enmity towards him which he had long felt. His death, however, closed this political animosity, nor had the private misrepresentations of the Archbishop's enemies hurt him in the King's favour. The noble historian, however, informs us, that the Archbishop had reason to be sorry for his

[1] Diary, p. 51. Heylin, p. 284, 285. Lord Clarendon, vol. i. p. 146.

appointment, " because it engaged him in civil business and matters of state, wherein he had little experience, and which he had hitherto avoided. But being obliged to it now by his trust, he entered upon it with his natural earnestness and warmth, making it his principal care to advance and improve the King's revenues by all the ways which were offered, and hearkened to all intimations and propositions of that kind; and not having had experience of that tribe of people who deal in that traffic, (a confident, senseless, and for the most part, a naughty people) he was sometimes misled by them to think better of some projects than they deserved; but then he was entirely devoted to what would be beneficial to the King, that all propositions and designs which were for the profit (only or principally) of particular persons, how great soever, were opposed and crossed, and very often stifled and oppressed by his power and authority, which created him enemies enough in the court, and many of ability to do mischief, who knew well how to recompense discourtesies, which they always called injuries. The revenue of too many of the court consisted principally in inclosures, and improvements of that nature, which he still opposed passionately, except they were founded upon law; and then, if it would bring profit to the King, how old and obsolete soever the law was, he thought he must justly advise the prosecution. And so he did a little too much countenance the commission concerning depo-

pulation, which brought much charge and trouble upon the people, and was likewise cast upon his account [1]."

Such are the impartial remarks of the noble historian, honourable to the Archbishop in the exercise of his authority. Whatever may be the inferences drawn from them, his integrity, his opposition to political intrigues and corruptions, and that loyalty which was the cause of all his sufferings, are triumphantly established.

[1] Lord Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 146, 147.

CHAPTER XV.

1635—1637.

Archbishop Laud's Regulation of the Cathedrals—Account of their state—Munificence of the Archbishop at Oxford—He procures the Caroline Charter—Proceedings of the Papists—Public contribution for the Palatinate—Appointment of Bishop Juxon to the Treasury—Dissatisfaction it excited—Honourable motives of the Archbishop—Character of Bishop Juxon—Claims of the Archbishop over the Universities—Disputes—The King and Court visit Oxford—Account of the entertainments—Prosecution of some Puritan ministers—Noble conduct of the Archbishop—State of affairs—Prosecution of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton—Notices of the two latter—History of the proceedings—Their sedition—Libels against Laud—Their sentence—Laud's speech in the Star-Chamber—Account of the punishment—Heroism of Prynne—Blasphemy of Burton.

In the year 1635, we find the Archbishop taking cognizance of the cathedral churches which had fallen into decay, or which had been neglected during the government of his predecessor, and all of which, indeed, bespoke in their appearance, more or less, the opinions of the bishop who then governed the diocese. He began with his own cathedral of Canterbury. He caused to be provided for the service of the holy communion those things necessary in the celebration of that sacred rite, which regulation

of the Archbishop the Puritans afterwards aspersed with their accustomed malevolence. He prepared a new body of statutes for that metropolitan cathedral, "which was sent thither," says his chaplain, "under the Great Seal, with his own hand subscribed to every leaf." One of those statutes made it imperative, that the deans, prebends, and other ecclesiastical persons, "at their coming in and going out of the choir, and at all approaches to the altar, should bow towards it, and make due reverence to Almighty God." This was also termed Popery by the Puritans; it could arise, says the Puritan historian, "from nothing but a belief of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament or altar, or from a superstitious imitation of the pagans worshipping towards the east[1]." Neal, however, as usual, is unhappy in his inference; he and his party might have known, that it was neither a belief in the real presence, nor an imitation of the superstitious notions of the pagans, but an act of reverence and worship to the Divine Being, who though every where present, yet is more peculiarly so in the temples consecrated to his service. It was a bowing *ad altare*, towards the altar, not *ad altare*, to the altar, as if divine worship was terminated there; and there was a difference between what was superstitious, and what was lawful and necessary in all approaches in the house of prayer[2]. But these re-

[1] Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 258.

[2] Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 150, 151.

gulations of course were opposed by many. "Such as disliked the gesture," says the Church historian, "could not or would not understand the distinction, as in the suburbs of superstition[1]."

The other cathedrals were also noticed by Laud; for Winchester a book of statutes was compiled; the disorders in Chichester cathedral were rectified; the statutes of Hereford were remodelled, and sanctioned under the Broad Seal; Lincoln, Norwich, Gloucester, Lichfield, and Worcester cathedrals were also repaired, and the public services properly conducted. In short, by the Archbishop's zealous

[1] These distinctions are ably set forth by Bishop Morton, who had succeeded the excellent Bishop Neile in the See of Durham, in a work published by him in 1631, in folio, entitled, "Of the Institution of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, by some called the Mass of Christ," which was reprinted this year, 1635, with large additions. Concerning the Papists, he observes, "The like distinction may be discerned between their manner of reverence in bowing towards the altar, for adoration of the Eucharist only, and ours in bowing, as well when there is no Eucharist on the table, as when there is, which is not to the table of the Lord, but to the Lord of the table, to testify the communion of all the faithful communicants therewith, even as the people of God did in adoring him before the ark his footstool," Psal. xcix. And yet, few will venture to assert, that Bishop Morton was superstitious, or inclined to Popery, who had exercised his pen more than any man living against its corruptions, as witness his "Full Satisfaction concerning a double Romish Inquisition," 4to. 1606. "Apologia Catholica," 8vo. 1606, and Part II. 4to. same year. "The Grand Imposture of the (now) Church of Rome manifested," 4to, 1628; and his "Antidotum adversus Ecclesiam Romam," 1637.

superintendence, aided by Bishops Davenant and Morton, "the cathedral churches recovered once more their ancient splendour, and served as an example to the parish churches which related to them [1]."

But while the Archbishop was thus employed in superintending the cathedral churches, he was no less active and disinterested in his private arrangements. When he went first to Lambeth, after his removal to the Primacy, he found the chapel of that venerable palace in a state which sufficiently evinced the notions of his predecessor. The windows broken and defaced, the stained glass patched up with ordinary glass; all things in it were in such a state, as to make him declare, "that he was ashamed to see it, and he could not enter it without disdain." He repaired this chapel at a very considerable charge, though great offence was taken at it, and it was even alleged against him as a *crime* at his trial [2]. His chapel at Croydon he also repaired: and to this place he frequently retired to enjoy a relaxation from fatigue and anxiety. Such was the public spirit of this great man: whose ecclesiastical revenues were solely devoted to works of public and private munificence; whose generosity was as unbounded as his mind was vast and comprehensive.

In the accounts of his province transmitted yearly by the Archbishop to the King, we discern at once

[1] Heylin, p. 276. [2] Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. p. 273.

his diligence in the discharge of his duties. These accounts are extremely valuable, and exhibit, in a striking manner, the state of religion at that period. From these accounts it appears that Laud exercised his authority with great moderation, dismissing several who refused to subscribe to the Articles of the Church only with a gentle or canonical admonition. The lecturers, also, seem to have been specially observed, and the reports of the different Bishops to their Metropolitan evince that general desire which prevailed amongst them to strengthen the Church against the attacks of the Puritan faction. These accounts, which extend from 1633 to 1639, are inserted by the learned Henry Wharton in his editions of the History of the Archbishop's Troubles and Trials.

But in these details of the Archbishop's actions, we must not forget the University of Oxford, of which he was the unwearied benefactor. In December, 1634-5, he procured from Sir Kenelm Digby a large collection of valuable MSS. for the public Library, which he sent thither with these intimations: first, that Sir Kenelm did not wish to subject "those MSS. to the strictness of Sir Thomas Bodley's statutes, but would have liberty given for any man of worth, that would be at the pains and expence of printing any of those books, to have them out of the Library, upon good security given to that purpose, and no other. Secondly, that he (Sir Kenelm) would reserve liberty to himself during his natural life, to borrow any of those books for his own private

use, whensoever he should ask them." The University, with a just sense of the value of this munificent benefaction, wrote a letter of thanks to the Archbishop as Chancellor, for his labour in procuring those MSS. and to Sir Kenelm Digby, for his generosity in bestowing them on the University of Oxford[1].

In 1635, the Archbishop's munificence was yet farther displayed to this venerable seat of learning. He gave various MSS. to the University, fourteen Hebrew volumes, fifty-five in Arabic, seventeen in Persian, four in Turkish, six in Russian, two in Armenian, twelve in the Chinese, forty-four in Greek, three in Italian, three in French, forty-six in English, and above two hundred Latin, besides forty-six others from the University of Wentzberg, taken in the Swedish war. In acknowledgment of this unprecedented liberality, he received a letter from the University, dated May 28, in which the members set forth their gratitude[2]. Nor was this all: for this year he procured a Prebendal Stall to be settled on the University Orator and his successors, for which he received another letter of thanks from the University[3]. This year, also, he procured from the King a charter of confirmation of the ancient liberties and privileges of the University,

[1] Gestis Regist. Cancel. Laud. fol. 12, 1030.

[2] Ibid. 109. Gest. Canc. 88, 89. "Reverendissime Cancellarie, dum verbis te fragilem fateris, et factis immortalem te comprobas," &c.

[3] Gestis Cancel. 97, 98.

known by the name of the Caroline Charter, which was finally ratified, and published in Convocation, on the 22d of June, 1636[1]. This last, it will be recollected, was one of the things which this noble prelate had "projected to do, if God blessed him in them." For in that list he thus writes, "To procure a large charter for Oxford, to confirm their ancient privileges, and obtain new ones for them, as large as those of Cambridge; which the latter had gotten since the reign of Henry VIII. but which Oxford had not." To this he afterwards added the word, "*Done*." This charter is a lasting memorial of the Archbishop's disinterestedness and munificence. It came to Oxford in March 1635, after being explained, on the petition of the Chancellor and Scholars, to the King at Woodstock. Its preamble sets forth, that it is "A grant whereby his Majesty doth confer to the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Oxford, and their successors, all their ancient charters and liberties formerly conferred by the late Queen Elizabeth." It is divided into twenty-two heads, or sections. 1. Cognizance of Pleas. 2. Court of Record. 3. Removing of Causes from other Courts. 4. Court Leets. 5. Orders and By-Laws to bind the Town. 6. Buying and selling of Victuals and Wares. 7. Coroners. 8. Felons' Goods. 9. Assize of Bread, Beer, and Wines, of Weights and Measures, Stalls, and Standing-Places in the Market. 10. Toll in the

[1] Diary, p. 53.

Market. 11. Licensing of Vintners and Alehouses. 12. To enquire of and seize corrupt Victuals. 13. To search suspected houses, and bear a mandate to the Mayor. 14. Townsmen answerable for such as they harbour. 15. The town inhibited from building without the leave of the Chancellor. 16. Anatomy Lecture. 17. Taxing or rating privileged persons. 18. Immunities to privilege men from Customs. 19. From Muskets and Salt-petre. 20. Payment of Subsidies, &c. 21. Feats of Arms, Plays, &c. 22. Impanel on Juries. 23. Printers. Lastly, an exemplification and amplification of an act of Parliament of 13th Elizabeth, for confirming all the lands, hereditaments, privileges, and possessions, of the University of Oxford, which they then had, that it may extend to all which hath fallen to the said University since that time, such as endowments of public lectures, of the Library, and common schools, and the like, with a general mandate, especially to the Mayor, Bailiffs, and Commonalty of Oxford, "for the due observation of these his Majesty's letters patent now made to the University of Oxford. Subscribed by Mr. Attorney General. His Majesty's pleasure signified by the *Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and by him procured*[1]."

The annotations in the Diary for this year are not of great importance. On the 18th of May we find the Archbishop with the Queen at Green-

[1] Vide the Caroline Charter, apud Gutch's edit. of Wood's Annals of Oxford, vol. ii. part. i. p. 399—402.

wich, transacting some private business. On the 30th of August, 1634, he makes this entry. "At Oatlands, the Queen sent for me, and gave me thanks for a business with which she entrusted me: her promise then, that she would be my friend, and that I should have immediate access to her when I had occasion." On the 18th of May, 1635, he thus writes, "My account to the Queen put off till Trinity Sunday, May 24. I then gave her, by myself, an assurance of all that was desired by me." This private business remains unexplained, nor do I find any account of it in the Archbishop's papers. Probably it was not of much consequence, and the short notice which Heylin gives of it appears worthy of attention, because he was a contemporary, and intimate with the Archbishop himself, from whom he probably received it. It is well known, that at this time the Queen held a greater influence over the King than she had formerly done, and it is likely that she wished to make the Archbishop her friend, by admitting him to a part of her councils. In the Christmas Holidays, 1635, a deputy appeared in England from the Pope, named Panzani, to reconcile a schism which had taken place between the regulars and the secular priests of the Romish Church. But, with that craftiness for which the Popish emissaries are remarkable, he at length contrived to obtain the favour of Cottington, Windebank, and others, and he finally made this proposal to them, whether his Majesty would permit the residence of

a Catholic Bishop of the English nation, to be nominated by his Majesty, and not to exercise his functions but as his Majesty should permit. Some of the Bishops, however, at Court, proposed this question to him in return, 'Whether the Pope would allow of such a Bishop of his Majesty's nomination as held the oath of allegiance lawful, and should permit the taking of it by Catholic subjects.' Panzani declared that he had no authority to decide on this matter, nevertheless, he so far succeeded, that the King, with the advice of his council, permitted an agent of the Pope to remain with the Queen, on this condition, that he should not be a priest. "This," says Heylin, "might possibly be the sum of this account which the Archbishop tendered to the Queen at Whitsuntide, after the arrival of Panzani, which, as it seems, was only to make way for Con. I cannot tell whether I am right or not in these particulars, but sure I am, that he resolved to serve the Queen no farther in her desires, than might consist both with the honour and the safety of the Church of England, upon which, as it was his greatest charge, he bestowed his sole cares and thoughts." These remarks are farther confirmed by the fact, that the Archbishop had a dispute with the Queen in October 1637, which he thus enters in his Diary, "My free speech to the King concerning the increase of the Romish party, the freedom at Denmark House, the carriage of Mr. Walter Montague, and Sir Toby Matthews. The Queen acquainted me with all I said that

very night, and was highly displeased with me, and so continues [1]."

On the 2d of September the Archbishop was with the King at Woodstock, whence he went to Cudsden, to see the palace which Dr. Bancroft, Bishop of Oxford, had built at his recommendation, to belong to that see. On the 3d, he went privately to St. John's, Oxford, to witness the progress of the building, where he remained only two hours, making arrangements for the finishing of the structure. September 23d, the indefatigable primate was superintending the repairs of St. Paul's, London; and towards the end of the year we find him entertaining Prince Charles, the Elector Palatine, and nephew to the King, at Lambeth. On the 2d of January 1635-6, the Archbishop baptized the princess Elizabeth, who was born on December 28, at St. James's Palace; and on the 28th of February, he consecrated Dr. Roger Manwaring, Bishop of St. David's, whom the Puritan zealots had so violently persecuted, along with Bishop Montague and Dr. Sibthorpe, in the third Parliament [2].

It is now time, however, to turn to the Archbishop's conduct as connected with the state. This year a public collection was made for the clergy of the Palatinate, at the intercession of the King's sister, the Queen of Bohemia, which the Archbishop

[1] Heylin, p. 286, 287. Diary, p. 55.

[2] Diary, p. 51—53. Le Neve's Fasti Anglicanæ Ecclesiæ, p. 514.

promoted with great assiduity. Those ministers were in a miserable condition, having been forced to abandon their country on account of their religion. Permission was granted by the King to make a public collection; but Laud objected to various expressions in the brief with great justice. Those ministers were termed of the same Church, which Laud denied, both because they were Calvinists, and had not received Episcopal ordination; and also, as they had termed the Church of Rome an Antichristian yoke, Laud most nicely remarked, that, if such were the case, it would follow that its ordinations are not valid, and the orders of the Church of England would be of no avail, nor differ from those of the Puritans. The King assented to Laud's alterations; a new brief was issued, and he promoted the collection, till the Puritan faction, by their fanatical zeal, opened his eyes to their crafty practices[1].

The promotion of the Archbishop to the commission of the Treasury was not altogether agreeable to him, and though he engaged in the duties of the office with his accustomed earnestness, yet he found many obstacles in his way which he had not contemplated. He engaged in disputes with Lord Cottington, Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had never been his friend, and, what perhaps had a greater effect upon him, his friend Sir Francis Windebank, adhered to Cottington's party. He was

[1] Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 271. Heylin, p. 286—290.

resisted and thwarted by the party who opposed him, more especially as Cottington understood the nature of the Treasury, and was studious to impose on Laud's inexperience. The Archbishop soon began to grow weary of this business, and to feel its toil and vexation, "as all other men are," observes the noble historian, "of the delays which are in all dispatches in that office, whilst it is executed by commission." Nevertheless, he remained a full year in the Treasury, investigating all its secret concerns, and its advantages; and the place, we are informed by Dr. Heylin, he found to be worth 7000*l.* per annum, without defrauding the King, or seizing the property of the subject.

The office of Lord Treasurer being the most lucrative in the kingdom, a considerable sensation was excited concerning the person to be appointed. Cottington was casting wistful eyes towards it, the Earls of Bedford, Hertford, Essex, and Lord Say, "and the greatest of the nobility, who were in the chief employments, looked upon it as the prize of one of them, such offices commonly making way for greater preferments." Whether, however, the disputes which had taken place between the Archbishop and Cottington in the months of May, June, and July, had encouraged the former to defeat, if possible, the wishes of that nobleman; or whether he believed, that in the interest he had successfully made, he had procured the office for the only man in the court of known integrity, certain it is, that he neither consulted his present peace, nor

his future safety. But be this as it may, Dr. Juxon, Bishop of London, Laud's friend and fellow-student, was appointed to the office of Lord Treasurer of England, on the 6th of March 1635-6 [1].

This appointment gave great dissatisfaction to the people in general, and more especially to those ambitious nobles, who, thirsting for power, were exasperated at being supplanted by an ecclesiastic, who had hitherto been little known, and who, they scrupled not to declare, was devoted to the Primate his patron. "The Bishop of London was a man so unknown," says the noble historian, "that his name was scarce heard of in the kingdom, and had been within two years before but a private chaplain to the King, and the president of a poor college in Oxford. This inflamed more men than were angry before, and no doubt did not only sharpen the edge of envy and malice against the Archbishop, (who was the known architect of this new fabric), but most unjustly indisposed many towards the Church itself, which they looked upon as the gulph ready to swallow all the great offices, there being others in view of that robe, who were ambitious enough to expect the rest."

It cannot be doubted that the Archbishop was guided by the most upright motives in promoting the appointment of Dr. Juxon to the office of Lord Treasurer. "He was infinitely pleased with what

[1] Diary, p. 53. Heylin, p. 286, 287. Lord Clarendon, vol. i. p. 148.

[2] Lord Clarendon, vol. i. 4to. p. 148.

was done," adds the noble historian, "and unhappily believed he had provided a stronger support for the Church [1]," nor did he, after this appointment, act in any other manner than as he was stimulated by his own consciousness of integrity, and the natural enthusiasm of his disposition. Lord Clarendon's remark is confirmed by the Archbishop's own words. "March 6. Sunday," says he, in his Diary, "William Juxon, Lord Bishop of London, made Lord High Treasurer of England. No churchman had it since Henry VII.'s time. I pray God bless him to manage it so, that the Church may have honour, and the King and the state service and contentment by it; and now, if the Church will not hold up themselves, under God, I can do no more." His principal object was, "to do the Church and the State service," and the experience which he had acquired while in the Treasury Commission, made it necessary that a disinterested man should fill that office. This is confirmed by a passage in his Diary, dated July 12, 1635. "At Theobald's, the soap business was ended, and settled again upon the new corporation, against my offer for the old soap-boilers. Yet my offer made the King's profit double, and to that, after two years, the new corporation was raised. How it is performed, let them look, whom his Majesty shall be pleased to trust with his Treasurer's staff [2]." It was charged against him at his

[1] Clarendon, vol. i. 4to. p. 148. ut sup.

[2] Diary, p. 51. 53. Heylin, p. 286.

trial, and asserted to be treason, but this he indignantly repelled, declaring, that though the share he had in the appointment was comparatively small, he had no other aim in it than "the service of the King, and the good of the Church[1]."

It is clear, therefore, that the Archbishop was not so much swayed in this business by private friendship, as by the belief that the appointment would be beneficial to the nation. Unlike many of his predecessors in that office, Juxon had no family to exalt to grandeur, no wife and children for whom it might have been expected that he felt an honourable solicitude. The Archbishop had known him long and intimately, and no man was better qualified for the office. Like the Archbishop, he was eminent for his integrity, piety, loyalty, and attachment to the Church; "and had nature," remarks Sir Philip Warwick, who knew both those distinguished prelates, "mingled their tempers, and allayed the latter by the prudence and foresight of the former, or invigorated the former with the zeal and activity of the other, she had formed a finer mass than she usually does in her most exact workmanship about mankind." Meek and steady in judgment, Juxon's profound knowledge of the civil law, which he had successfully studied, capacitated him for secular business; and though he found the Treasury much diminished, yet he acted with such moderation, as not only to support the dignity of the royal

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 289.

household, and to administer uniform justice in all public business, but he also reduced the debts of the crown, and made the Treasury rich in a surplus sum. Fewer complaints were made against him than had been made against any of his predecessors; his conduct was so calm and circumspect, and his advice at all times so judicious, that the King himself declared, that Dr. Juxon never gave his opinion freely in his life, but when he had it, he was always the better for it. It was indeed feared, and perhaps ardently hoped, by some, that he would be unable to fulfil the arduous duties of his office, and, as Heylin observes, "sink under the burden of it, as Williams did under the custody of the Seals." But his mildness and prudence obtained for him such a reputation, that though he was a Bishop, which was crime enough in the eyes of the Puritan zealots, and in that capacity united the office of Lord Treasurer, two most dangerous offices in that age of fanaticism, he was neither envied, nor subject to the caprice of the times. Lord Falkland bore witness to his integrity and moderation in the Long Parliament, when he declared, that Juxon, "in an *unexpected place and power*, expressed an equal moderation and humility, being neither ambitious before, nor proud after, either of the crozier or the white staff." "It was by means of his admirable temper and conduct," says Sir Philip Warwick, "that he weathered the most dreadful storm that ever the nation felt, and at last rode triumphantly into the harbour, without any ship-

wreck of his honour or principles. Never was there a more fortunate pilot, or a more upright man." Such was the man for whose appointment Archbishop Laud was charged with treason—a man whom his very enemies were compelled to admire and reverence. But with political enthusiasts every thing is a crime which is not sanctioned by their party; and, with religious enthusiasts, that churchman is nevertheless worldly-minded, who does not aid and encourage their spiritual rhodomontade. Stimulated by such principles, men forget themselves; they are transported by passions destructive of civil order.

Thus conceiving, as undoubtedly he had a right, so far as human foresight extended, that he had done his duty towards Church and State by the promotion of Juxon, Archbishop Laud entered with his wonted ardour into his duties, alike regardless of the smiles of friends or the hatred of his enemies. To him, the rich and the poor were on the same equality: he knew no distinction, save merit combined with honourable birth. His enemies at court, however, were indefatigable in their opposition, and Cottington, in particular, "a master of temper, and of the most profound dissimulation," had resolved to employ every exertion to diminish the Archbishop's influence. Laud's temper was naturally warm, and he had been accustomed to deliver his opinions with a freedom which could not silently endure contradiction; and, when any one dissented from him, he often expressed himself in a manner

which excited his grief afterwards, and which made him at those times ready to acknowledge with regret. Cottington took advantage of these occasions, by contriving to lead the Primate into a mistake, and, although not unlikely he was pursuing the very same measures as Laud himself was employing, he excited his anger, and then exposed him to the persons present. And, we are informed by Lord Clarendon, that he always endeavoured to do this ill-office to the Archbishop in the presence of the King.

I have already mentioned the Archbishop's solicitude for the Cathedral churches. It was one of his projected things, "to settle the statutes of all the Cathedral Churches of the new Foundations;" that is, those founded in the reign of Henry VIII., after the dissolution of the monasteries. These are Canterbury, Winchester, Ely, Worcester, Norwich, and Rochester, and the bishoprics founded by him were Oxford, Gloucester, Bristol, Peterborough; and Chester, with those of Durham and Carlisle, which three, with Chester, are in the province of York. The Cathedrals of the old Foundation are, London, Chichester, Salisbury, Exeter, Wells, Lichfield, Hereford, Exeter, and the four bishoprics in Wales, all in the province of Canterbury, while in the other province, the archiepiscopal see of York only existed, the prelates of which not only governed the four suffragan dioceses as their own, but anciently laid claim also to Episcopal jurisdiction over the Scottish Church. The Cathedrals of the old

Foundation required no alteration in their statutes except Hereford, but the others were all imperfect, and had never been confirmed, which occasioned many disputes between the Deans and the Prebendaries. The Archbishop resolved to rectify this, had not his misfortunes, induced by the Scottish insurrections and the English rebellion, restrained him from this noble undertaking. The only Cathedral whose statutes he was enabled to rectify was Canterbury, and he has duly recorded the service he did to that venerable and ancient metropolitan See.

Nor was Archbishop Laud's attention confined solely to those matters. He insisted, this year, on his right, as Metropolitan, to visit the Universities, which occasioned a dispute between him and the Heads of Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge; the former claiming his right *jure metropolitico,* the latter insisting, that this right was vested in the King alone. A contest accordingly took place, and the cause was heard before the King, on the 21st of June, at Hampton Court. The Archbishop standing at the right hand of the King, declared, "That by letters he had acquainted the two Universities that he conceived he had power to visit them, as being within his province and metropolitan jurisdiction, and desired to know their answers. To this," said he, "a civil answer was returned from Oxford and Cambridge, that to yield to such a proposition by their own power, without a command from his Majesty, were a wrong to the Universities." He

then delivered a petition to the King, imploring a hearing, "for the Church of England would never be able to set things right, without some control over the Universities." He was opposed by the Earl of Holland, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, who hoped "the King would not resign his ancient privilege." The cause was argued at great length by the Attorney General on the part of the Archbishop, the Recorder of London on the part of the University of Cambridge, and Sergeant Thin for Oxford. It was at length finally adjudged to belong to the Archbishop, under certain restrictions; but the troubles of the nation, which shortly afterwards succeeded, precluded him from exercising his metropolitan right. "My troubles," says he, "began then to be foreseen by me, and I visited them not[1]."

It is evident that the Archbishop did not insist

[1] Diary, p. 53. Troubles and Trials, p. 307, 308. Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. p. 324—332. Here, however, we must notice a trick of the voluminous Prynne. "The Archbishop," says the learned Henry Wharton, "had collected many papers, decrees, and precedents, to assert his privilege of visiting the Universities, in right of his See, about the year 1635, which, being seized by Prynne, among his other papers at Lambeth, were by him, after the Archbishop's death, published, *in his own name*, with this title, "The Plea of the University of Oxford refuted," London, 1637, in quarto. The pamphlet now lies before me; it consists of 164 pages, and bears incontestible proofs that it was *not written* by Prynne, as it contains a kind of logical arrangement which is in vain sought for in his fanatical writings.

upon this right of metropolitan visitation from any wish to exercise his power; otherwise he would have speedily given commission to Brent, his Vicar-General, to act for him, had he been unable to undertake the visitation in person. His grand object was to connect the Universities with the Church; a measure which will always be regarded as salutary and indispensable, otherwise religion must infallibly suffer, or, to say the least, always presupposing that there is an Established Church, which is necessary from the very nature of things, the religion which is professed by the majority of the nation, must be exposed to the risk of being brought into contempt by factious and fanatical men. We have seen that the English Universities could hardly restrain the current of Puritanism in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., nor in this reign were they altogether free from the fermentations which the Presbyterian notions excited. But, if the Church had not been able to control them, that turbulence would have been increased by the wildest enthusiasm, which would have known no limitations. Laud probably foresaw the evils which would arise from their not being altogether under the control of the Church; he indeed declares that he foresaw them; and wished that cognizance should be taken of all Schismatics and Dissenters, who, though they continually declaimed against the Church, could not, or would not, depart from its communion, but who continued to disturb it, till they impiously effected its overthrow.

Our attention, however, must again be directed to Oxford. On the 9th of July, 1636, a Convocation was held, in which was read a letter from the Archbishop, dated June 16th, with some farther gifts from the munificent prelate[1]. On the 19th

[1] Gestis Cancel. Lond. p. 109, 110. Reg. 128. "Mitto autem," says Laud, "Libros non uno ex idiomate descriptos, quos spero sacrabit Deus. Sunt autem, ni fallor, Hebraici *octodecim*, Persici *quatuordecim*, Arabici *quinquaginta*, Armenicus *unus*, Ethiopici *duo*, Chinensis *unus*, Græci *duodecim*, Latini *sexaginta quinque*, Anglicani *duodecim*, Gallici *quatuor*, Hibernici *duo*. Quos omnes non sine sumptu intra anni proxime elapsi spatium cogessi, et nunc in Bibliothecam Bodleianam reponendos mitto. Cum his, mitto Astrolatinum Arabicum ære Persiori descriptum, quo me ditavit vir omni eruditionis genere instructissimus, et olim Academiæ nostræ Alumnus, nunc decus, Johannes Seldenus. Mitto etiam effigiem Sereniss. Regis Caroli, ne fama ejus ære perennior suo ære destitueretur. Nullibi autem melius locari potest Rex Musarum Patronus, quam apud vos et inter Musas. Volo autem ut in claustris illis ubi libri mei MSS. siti sunt collocetur caput hoc nunquam satis venerandum, ut in memoriam vestram revocet, cujus dignatione (sub Deo) factum est, ut illa, qualia qualia sunt, quæ in vestram gratiam facta sunt, præstare possem. Et ut veluti inspector ibi stet, nequis libros, quasi sub intuitu Regis positos, ullo modo violare ausit. Nummi mihi non sunt. Ea in re S. Petro fere æqualis sum. Numismata tamen quædam diuturnâ solicitudine conquisivi. Acernum nolui vobis mittere, sic enim usui nulli sunt, nisi videre, et numerare ad studiosos pertineat. Redegi itaque omnia quæ paravi in seriem eamque doctrinalem, ut per eandem ordinem sæculorum, et temporum positis uno quasi intuitu aspicere et per Reversa, ut vocantur, maxima, quasque nummorum imperatorum actiones, et temporum vices, et accidentia rerum publicarum planius videre, &c. Insuper, etiamsi ab Idololatria abhorret animus, tamen, quo

of August, after an escape from an accident, he prepared to set out for the University, where he arrived six days before the end of August, that he might make preparations to receive the King and Queen, who purposed to visit the city. On the 29th, the King entered Oxford in great state, "there," says the Archbishop, "to be entertained by me as Chancellor of the University." The Archbishop, the Vice-Chancellor, and various of the Heads of Houses and Doctors, met the King near Woodstock, and there joined the royal cavalcade. On returning, the procession assumed a regular form, and entered the city. Various speeches were delivered; the usual ceremonies were performed of delivering up and restoring the insignia of authority. Through Northgate-street and Fish-street, the procession proceeded ("lined," says Antony Wood, "with scholars of all degrees, in their formalities, yet neither they nor the citizens made any expression of joy, or uttered, as the manner is, Vivat Rex:") until the King arrived at Christ Church gate, where he was addressed in an eloquent and modest oration by the University Orator. After which the Archbishop, as Chancellor, in the name of the University, presented to the King a Bible, richly ornamented, and a pair of gloves. To the Queen he also presented a similar pair of

vobis contemptui sit magis Gentium vecordia, duo accipietis superstitionis ludibria, Idola duo; unum Ægyptiorum vetus, alterum Hesternum Indorum Occidentalium."

gloves; to the Prince Elector, the King's nephew, the immortal work of Hooker, entitled "Ecclesiastical Polity,"—a gift worthy to be offered to a Prince by the University, especially as written by one of its most illustrious members, and worthy of a prince to receive,—and to his brother, the celebrated Prince Rupert, an English translation of Cæsar's Commentaries, by Sir Clement Edmonds. The Queen was then conducted to her lodgings, and the King afterwards proceeded to divine service in the Cathedral, attended by the Chancellor and the nobles in his suite.

The King and Queen were lodged in Christ Church, and, after supper in the evening, a comedy was acted in the splendid hall of that College. Its title, we are informed by the industrious Wood, was "Passion calmed, or the Settling of the Floating Island," written by Strode, the University Orator. "It was such an one," says our indefatigable antiquary, "that had more of the moral than the poet in it; and though it was well penned, it did not take so well with the courtiers as it did with the togated crew." From the description of the scenery, dresses, and other apparatus of dramatic representations, it appears to have been splendidly performed by the Scholars; and the fact may be here noticed by the way, that we are indebted to the Scholars of Oxford alone for all the improvements in scenic exhibitions. The following day was devoted to public duties. The King heard a sermon in the Cathedral, preached by the Senior Proctor, from

Luke xix. 38. after which, in the Convocation, before it was dissolved by the Chancellor, the Princes Charles and Rupert, with some of the nobility, were admitted Masters of Arts. After visiting the Chancellor's buildings at St. John's, the royal party dined in that College. The Archbishop entertained his Sovereign with due magnificence. "I thank God," said he, "I had the happiness that all things were in good order, and that no man went out of the gates, courtiers or others, but contented, which was a happiness beyond expectation [1]."

In the afternoon, another play was acted in the Hall by the Scholars of St. John's, entitled, "The Hospital of Lovers," written by Wilde, a Fellow of that Society. The King then proceeded to Christ Church, where, in the evening, there was a third dramatic representation in the Hall, written by a member of the House, entitled, "The Royal Slave." The proceedings of that day gave universal satisfaction: and never, perhaps, often as Oxford has been honoured by the presence of royalty, was there so much genuine English feeling evinced, as was at this royal visit during the Chancellorship of Archbishop Laud. "It was the day of St. Felix," says he, "and all things went happily [2]."

On the following day, August 31, their Majesties departed towards Winchester, after thanking the

[1] Gestis Cancel. Laud, p. 122—128.

[2] Diary, p. 53.

University for their loyal hospitality, and on September the Chancellor returned, after having "entertained all the Heads of Houses together[1]."

But the state of parties at this period requires to be noticed. The Puritan enthusiasts were proceeding silently, though steadily, in their opposition. The Book of Sports had given great offence, and unfortunately afforded a theme for those political fanatics to declaim against the Church. Though its principal design was to reduce the refractory ministers to uniformity, the prosecutions which followed only stimulated them in their sedition. Various of the Puritan preachers were suspended, some by the Archbishop himself, others by one or two of the suffragan Bishops. Those who were suspended by the Archbishop may be noticed—well-known zealots, and seditious men. Richard Culmer, minister at Goodneston, in Kent, the author of that fanatical and lying pamphlet, entitled "Cathedral Newes from Canterbury," published in 1644, in which he pretends to shew "the Canterburian Cathedrall to bee in an Abbey-like, corrupt, and rotten condition:" the second, John Player of Kennington, Surrey; the third, Thomas Hieron, minister of Thornhill, in the same county, and, according to Prynne, "godly ministers of the word." They petitioned the Archbishop for a release, but they were answered, "that if they knew not how to obey, he knew not how to grant." A fourth was Thomas

[1] Diary, p. 53.

Wilson, "a godly learned minister," says Prynne, who experienced the like deprivation [1].

While it is to be regretted that the Book of Sports was ever revived, in which, be it remarked, the Archbishop had only a secondary concern, it cannot be denied, that the Puritans overcharged the account of the proceedings against their enthusiastic associates, and were by no means scrupulous about the truth of their statements. Prynne, in the year 1636, published a tract, which he thought proper to term, "A Divine Tragedie lately acted, or a Collection of sundry memorable examples of God's judgments upon Sabbath-breakers and other like Libertines, in their unlawful sports, happening within the realme of England, in the compass of only two years last past, since the Book was published," and its contents prove him in this instance to have been the most credulous and superstitious fanatic of his party. Henry Burton, in his seditious sermon, which he entitled, "For God and the King," was pleased to observe, that the persecution was greater than that of Queen Mary's reign. Wren was at that time Bishop of Norwich, and he was foully libelled by this enthusiast. But great as the clamour was against Dr. Wren's proceedings, and though he was compared by Williams of Lincoln to a "wren mounted on the wings of an eagle," and alleged by him to have sent out "letters of persecution," it appeared that out of the 1500

[1] Canterburie's Doome, p. 148, 149. Heylin, p. 290.

ecclesiastics who were then in that diocese, including the lecturers, not above nineteen were suspended; that out of that number eight were released, and six only altogether suspended, and of these, some were suspended for other and more notorious acts of non-conformity. In short, not above thirty were involved in any kind of ecclesiastical censure, and these were all of them well-known enthusiasts and discontented factionists; and yet, with this knowledge, Burton had the hardihood to assert, "that in all Queen Mary's time there was not so great a havoc made (in so short a time) of the faithful ministers of God, in any part, yea, of the whole land."

To silence the Arminian controversies, and to insist that men should not preach the subtle dogma of predestination or election, were considered by those enthusiasts as awful crimes. Their extemporaneous effusions, termed by them prayers, were made the vehicles, as is frequently and indeed must of necessity be the case in extemporaneous effusions, of conveying their own private prejudices and angry passions: some prayed as they pleased, others prayed sedition: all, in general, abounded with ignorance, irreverence, obscenity, and a total misconception of the nature of that Being whom they so daringly, and, in the pride of a false perfection, addressed. For taking cognizance of these extravagances, the Bishops were traduced, and especially, as we are informed by Heylin, Dr. Peirce, the Bishop of Bath and Wells. "His *crimes*," says that writer, "were, that he had commanded

the ministers of his diocese to catechise their parishioners on the Sunday afternoons, from the authorized catechism in the Book of Common Prayer, and that he had suppressed the lecturers in most parts of his diocese." These, with the Puritans, were damnable crimes, though that prelate had done no more than his duty in following the royal instructions. In the latter instance, he was afterwards justified by the Archbishop, "who took the blame of it," says our author, "upon himself, if any thing were blameworthy in it, though then a prisoner in the Tower, and exposed to the malice and the power of his enemies: for such was his undaunted spirit, that when Ash, a member of the House of Commons, demanded of him in the Tower, whether the Bishop of Bath and Wells had received directions from him? he answered, that he had, and that the Bishop had done nothing in it, but what became an obedient diocesan to his metropolitan. So careful was he of preserving those who acted under him, that he chose rather to augment the number of his own misfortunes, than occasion theirs[1]."

During the remainder of the year 1636, little occurred of any interest connected with Archbishop Laud, and, indeed, I am compelled to pass over some proceedings connected with the Church and the University, that I may proceed to more important details. On the 10th of June, 1637, the

[1] Heylin, p. 294. Canterburie's Doome, p. 99, 100.

Archbishop completed a work which he had previously classed among his projected things, namely, "A book containing the records which are in the Tower, and concern the Clergy." He was at the sole charge of getting this book transcribed on fair vellum, and it was brought to him finished on the above day, and he deposited it in his library, as he says, for the service of posterity. This collection extends from the 20th year of Edward I. to the 14th of Edward IV., and is now in the Library of Lambeth Palace.

But this year is perhaps the most lamentable in English history. Although the nation was seemingly at peace and prosperous, although the court was magnificent and virtuous, the Church elevated by the piety, the munificence, and the learning of its governors and clergy, the kingdom wealthy, commerce extended, and the Universities flourishing by the cultivation of letters and the renown of their several members,—there had been long cherished a secret spirit of dissatisfaction; religious extravagance and hypocrisy had been quieted but not subdued. Puritanism, since its first introduction in the reign of Elizabeth, had made rapid progress in this age of fanaticism, and a flame was destined to break out this year, which was to desolate the three kingdoms, and to afford a temporary triumph to ambition and treason. This may be said to be the first calamitous year in Charles' unhappy reign; the beginning of his disasters which ended in his martyrdom; the discontented in Scot-

land held up the affairs of that kingdom as the ostensible origin of treason and rebellion, which were fomented by their English confederates. The fierce and stern enthusiasts of the North resolved on devastation, and the Calvinistic war was to rage with desperate fury. "Although the people (in Scotland) were averse from Episcopacy, although this aversion was fomented by the harangues of their preachers, yet the religious tenets of the people, and the offence which they entertained were *not the cause*, but the *engine* of those troubles which distracted the nation during this period of our history, which indeed may be termed the empire of fanaticism and hypocrisy, of tyranny and rebellion [1]."

Before I proceed, however, to this important, though at present necessarily very rapid detail, some other transactions must be noticed. This year some factious and refractory men had resolved to establish their enthusiasm on the shores of America, and amid the forests of New England, whither, they had previously avowed, the gospel had departed, to act without the restraints of law, as it respects religion. Those disorderly emigrations, without a royal licence, it was thought expedient to restrain, "because of the many idle and obstinate humours, whose only or principal end was to live without the reach of authority." Eight ships were stationed in the Thames, to convey a host of zealots across the Atlantic, but they were stopped by an order of

[1] Arnot, p. 104.

Council; and as many of the Puritan ministers, regardless of the *amor patriæ*, resolved to gratify that extravagance which they could not indulge in their own country, and were ready to follow that which they termed "the gospel," into New England. An order of Council also prohibited "all ministers unconformable to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England; and that no clergyman should be suffered to pass to the foreign plantations without the approbation of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London." These orders were founded on obvious reasons of state, but they increased the factious discontentment. Oliver Cromwell, it is said, was among those intended emigrants thus stopped, who, with some others, had resolved to seek his fortunes beyond the Atlantic. He returned to his associates, to indulge in his hypocrisy and fanaticism.

The symptoms of dissatisfaction were drawing towards a crisis, and some prosecutions of this year accelerated the national calamities. The first case is the trial of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton, in the Star-Chamber, which, after considerable delays, took place on the 14th of June, during Trinity Term.

Prynne has already been introduced to the notice of the reader. He had been prosecuted for his seditious insolence in 1633, but the punishment had no effect in reducing him to obedience. In 1635, and the two following years, he published several books, worse than the Histrio-Mastyx; one he termed, "A Looking-Glasse for all Lordly Pre-

lates," 1636, 4to.; a second, "The Unbishoping of Timothy and Titus," 1636; a third, "Certain Queries propounded to the Bowers at the Name of Jesus, and to the Patrons thereof," 1636; a fourth, "A Divine Tragedie lately acted," already referred to; and a fifth, "A Quench-Coale, or a Brief Disquisition and Inquiry in what place of the Church or Chancel the Lord's Table ought to be situated," which he designed as an answer to a tract of Dr. Heylin's, entitled "A Coal from the Altar," written in reply to Bishop Williams's "Letter to the Vicar of Grantham." This *Brief Disquisition* extends to no less than three hundred and fifty-eight closely printed quarto pages, besides seventy-eight pages of an introduction. But that which was properly the cause of the prosecution against him was another publication, published in 1636, entitled, "News from Ipswich," in which he reflected on Bishop Wren, the learned and pious Bishop of Norwich, who resided in that city, and other prelates, in the most scandalous manner. The Archbishop also was treated in no very gentle manner by this fanatical Mastyx, and he descants on his "arch-piety, arch-charity," terms him "arch-agent for the devil"—that "Beelzebub himself had been Archbishop, and the like to those, a most triumphant arch, indeed, to adorn his victories." The Bishops are generally termed "Luciferian Lord Bishops, execrable traitors, devouring wolves," and Bishop Wren is "a bloody persecutor."

The ravings of this man might, perhaps, in another

age have been treated with contempt, but the reign of Charles I. was not one for such leniency, more especially as the book was strictly punishable by law, as a gross and impious libel, and rendered more criminal by the daring conduct of the author, who was at the time a state prisoner. He was, therefore, served with an indictment. Of his two companions, who, with himself, were men of furious passions, and were convicted of printing and publishing sedition, schism, and daring libels on Church and State, I here insert an account.

John Bastwick was born at Wrottle, in Essex, in 1593[1], and entered of Emanuel College, Cambridge, 19th May, 1614. Having left the University without a Degree, he travelled on the Continent for nine years, and at length took the degree of Doctor of Medicine at the University of Padua. When he returned to England, he settled at Colchester, where he practised physic; but being afflicted with a mania against Popery, he commenced author, and wrote violently against the Popish Church[2]. In the year 1633, while he was in Holland, Bastwick published a work, which he termed "Elenchus Religionis Papisticæ," also, "Flagellum Pontificis et Episcoporum Latialium," which he circulated throughout England with great assiduity. Although it was specially pretended to be a confutation of one

[1] Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 151.

[2] Lord Clarendon's History, vol. i. Fuller, ut sup. Whitelocke's Memorials, p. 22.

Short, who had maintained the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church, and although he himself declares in the Dedication, that he intends not to animadvert upon those Bishops who held their authority from temporal princes, yet, as the Church historian aptly remarks, "he exposed his character to the Latin bishops beyond the Alps, and our English prelates reckoned themselves touched therein." For these productions, he was summoned in 1633, before the High Commission; on the 12th of February, fined 1000*l.*, excommunicated, degraded from his practice of medicine, and his books condemned to be burnt; to pay the costs, and to be imprisoned till he retracted his opinions. Two years he remained in the Gatehouse, where, being a man of violent temper, instead of expressing contrition, he published "Apologeticus ad Præsules Anglicanos[1]," published at London, in octavo, 1636. This book, being written in pure and elegant Latin, was not productive of much mischief, but he followed it up by one in English, entitled, "The Letany of John Bastwicke, Doctor of Physicke, London, 4to. 1637," in which he abused the Church, charged the Bishops with introducing Popery, and attacked the government, especially the Star-Chamber and High Commission Courts, with

[1] Πράξεις τῶν Ἐπισκόπων, sive, Apologeticus ad Præsules Anglicanos criminum Ecclesiasticorum in Curia Celsæ Commissionis. Accedunt ad calcem, ejusdem autoris duæ Epistolæ, una de Papisticæ Religionis futilitate, altera de Romanæ Ecclesiæ falsitate. 8vo. 1636.

great virulence. "A piece it is," remarks Heylin, "so silly and contemptible, that nothing but the sin and malice which appeared in every line thereof, could possibly have preserved it from being ridiculous." The abuse which it contained, however, was of a nature which could not be passed over in silence, as among the enthusiasts of that age, every extravagance was eagerly adopted, and attended with dangerous consequences. According to Bastwick, "the prelates are invaders of the King's prerogative royal, contemners and despisers of the Holy Scriptures, advancers of Popery, superstition, idolatry, and profaneness; also, they abuse the King's authority, to the oppression of his most loyal subjects, and therein exercise great cruelty, tyranny, and injustice; and in execution of those impious performances, they shew neither wit, honesty, nor temperance. Nor are they either servants of God, or of the King, but of the devil, being enemies of God, and the King, and of every living thing that is good. All which," adds Whitelocke, "he (Bastwick) is ready to maintain[1]."

In perusing the "Apologeticus," I find these remarks strictly verified, though, as the work is in Latin, it was not capable of such obvious constructions as the "Letany." The usual exceptions against Episcopacy, which have been urged and refuted a thousand times, are made; the work, however, dis-

[1] Whitelocke's Memorials, p. 26. Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 381, 382. Heylin, p. 309. Nalson's Collections, vol. i. p. 499—506. Collier, vol. ii. p. 771. Clarendon, vol. i. p. 200.

plays considerable learning, and its author was master of a pure and easy Latin style. "Dicam quod res est," says Bastwick, "in ipso terrore circum frementis me exitii, hominum tamen miserebar oblitorum veteris præcepti, Non dices falsum testimonium; et negligentium novi, Quod tibi fieri non vis alteri ne feceris. Quis enim in illa judicum classe de nomine, fama, fortunisque suis ab eodem accusatore, teste, judice, decerni æquus patiatur? Sed in hanc nos patientiæ sortem Deus allegit. Redibunt forte beatiora tempora, cum Christi lex reverentius, Humanitatis æquabilius habebitur." He then proceeds: "Articuli prodibant concatenati triginta et septem, quorum hi maxime capitales; beâsse me—virum bonum geminis frui Beneficiis—Fas esse genu flectere ad mentionem nominis Jesu—Fas esse genibus flexis manducare panem et bibere vinum in sacra cœna—me proborum Episcopis indidisse agnomentum Grollorum—me multo cum præconio publicasse librum Loitonii—mihi in votis fuisse ponere osculum cruentis Loitonii vulneribus cum aures illi raperentur, ut olim piis factitatum erga laniatos martyres. Me vulgato typis libro Presbyteri et Episcopi paritatem asseruisse[1]." He then proceeds to comment on those articles, and afterwards discourses on the subject in no very moderate language, but he is peculiarly abusive under the head which he entitles, "Sylloge usurpationum quibus Episcopi imminuerunt prærogativam Regis

[1] Apologeticus, p. 5, 6.

contra disertas regni leges et statuta," where, after quoting cap. 15. 27th of Henry VIII. he exclaims, "Quicquamne apertius pro ministrorum paritate? Quicquamne in prævaricatores gravius minari possit? Nec deterret tamen vos hujus edicti severitas Præsules, seu visitantes, seu in Consistoriis præsidentes, a fabricandis constitutionibus novis, cæremoniis Canonibus, articulis jurisjurandi formulis, quæ rege inconsulto, nullo accepto mandato typis divulgatis, ecclesiarumque Gardianis observanda exequendaque committitis, præscriptis tantum nominibus et autoritate vestris, tanquam Legislatoria potestas summa sit penes vestrum ordinem, tantumque monarchichæ dominationis in illo supersit, quantum in ipso rege præsidente comitiis. Cujus insolentiæ fastus omnem vestro sæculorum vel adæquat vel egreditur cleri contumacis superbiam, et Art. 34. Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ repugnat[1]."

Let us, however, turn to the "Letany," in which there is "An Universall Challenge to the whole world, to prove the parity of ministers not to be *jure divino*," and which Bastwick says, is "a booke very usefull and profitable for all good Christians to read, for the stirring up of devotion in them likewise, Prov. chap. xxv. ver. 2. Printed by the speciall procurement, and for the especiall use of our English prelates, in the yeare of Remembrance, anno 1637." There is a libel in the very title page, but he fulminates most lustily in the opening epistle,

[1] Apologeticus, p. 146, 147.

which he entitles, "John the Phisitian to the vertuous and elect Lady, the Lady Walgrave, at her house in Worminford, in Essex." "I dare boldly maintaine," saith this Medico-Mastyx [1], "they (the Bishops) are more disobedient and worse than the devils themselves, to say nothing in passion and perturbation. Of all creatures, bishops, priests, and deacons, are most wicked, ungratefull, disobedient, and rebellious. The Lord Jesus saith, Bring those mine enemies to mee hither, that I may slay them that would not that I should rule over them. If slaughter to a kingdom be the preservation of it, then the prelates are the maintainers of it, for of all creatures they are most rebellious and impious. Nay, I peremptorily affirm, that the prelates are worse than the devil." They are "rook-catchers, soule murdering hirelings, atheists, a commonwealth of rats." "The truth is," says he, "they are God's rebels, and enemies, both by the law of God and the land, to God and the King, and, like the giants of old, warre against the clouds, and if to say so be a scandall, I will live and die in it." "To say nothing of the Bishop of London, who was put into his office with such supreme dignity and incomparable majesty, as he seemed a great king or mighty emperour, to be inaugurated and installed in some

[1] This is a title which is given him in another of his books, entitled, "Medico-Mastix, or a Pill for the Doctor, being a short Reply to a late vindictive Letter sent to Mr. Vicars, in the name of Dr. Bastwick, concerning Lieut.-Col. John Lilburne, by E. A. a She-Presbyterian." 4to. 1645.

superlative monarchy; see the prelate of Canterbury, in his ordinary garb, riding from Croydon to Bagshot, with forty or fifty gentlemen well mounted attending upon him, two or three coaches, with four and six horses," &c. and in this style he proceeds in his railing, till he signs himself the virtuous and elect lady's "poore orator." But the other parts are, if possible, still worse. He talks of "Father William of Canterbury, his Holiness, and William London, Magnificent Rector of the Treasury,"—the "Prior of Canterbury there, William the Dragon, and your Abbey lubber of York, the oracle of the north." "I will stand to," says he; "I am resolved never to leave the field by flying, but to join battle, and fight against the great dragon, Father Antichrist, and against Gog and Magog, as long as I can stand upon my legs. For had I as many lives as I have haires on my head, I would be prodigal of them all in this cause; and had I as much blood in my veines as would swell the Thames, I would spill it every drop in the quarrel I am now embarked in. If Father William of Canterbury think that I am afraid of him, he is metropolitanically mistaken, for I neither fear nor love him, neither is there any affection or passion in me so contemptible, that I deem him, or any prelate in England, worthy to be an object of it." The Archbishop is styled his "reverend Highness of Croydon," and, "had not the prelates lived under a gracious prince, they would have been hanged for their doings." The Attorney-General

is termed " Doctor Satan, the accuser of the brethren." Bishop Wren, " Saint Wren, now Pope of Norwich," and the office of a Bishop is " the office of Satan, and Judas that Archbishop and Primate of traytors." In short, so hardened was this medical fanatic in his wickedness, that he ends his Litany in these words: " Heare is the end of the First Part of the Letany of Doctor Bastwick, *there are seven parts more* of it yet to come."

I have quoted thus largely from, or rather analyzed, this singular performance, which is a precious specimen of Puritanical nonsense and sedition, in order to shew the necessity of punishing those fools for their egregious folly. Yet had there been only folly here, " John the phisitian," would have remained unmolested in " Limbo Patrum:" but when we recollect, that this was a daring insult to the government from a person already a state prisoner, that it libelled both Church and State, and abused the personal character of individuals, besides the fact, that such fanaticism would be greedily swallowed by the factious zealots of that age, we shall admit that they deserved no ordinary punishment, more especially as Bastwick was so obstinate, that none of his friends could prevail upon him to expunge the offensive passages [1].

[1] It may be proper to mention here, that a second edition of Bastwick's Elenchus Religionis Papisticæ was printed at London, 1641, in 12mo. At the beginning, there is a letter of thanks to the King, the parliament, and the people, in which he bit-

Messrs. Bogue and Bennet call the punishment of the three religious fanatics, "a woeful tragedy." This is to be expected, for Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton, are exalted by them to the honours of suffering saints, while they are in a phrensy when they name the Archbishop; they candidly say, that it is impossible to name him without a term of disrespect. This is Puritan liberality—the essence, doubtless, of non-conformity: but I am confident that Messrs. Bogue and Bennet, like their great oracle Neal, never read those effusions: otherwise they could not have disputed the adage of the wise man, "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him."

Leaving "John the phisitian," his third companion, Henry Burton, next presents himself, whom Heylin justly terms "the great master-piece of

terly abuses Archbishop Laud, and it concludes with three letters, one to a Protestant who had recanted to Popery, a second to one St. John, on the absurdity of the Popish religion, the third to one Coleman, denying that the Church of Rome is a true Church. The book is an answer to three questions, whether Christ constituted St. Peter monarch, or supreme head of the Catholic Church, nay, whether St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome? Whether the Pope (if he is a Bishop) as Bishop of Rome, has authority and jurisdiction over his fellow Christians or not? Whether the Popish Bishops are true Bishops?" These positions, he conceives, are refuted by Matt. xx. 25, 26. Mark x. 43, 44.; Luke xxii. 25, 26.; Acts xx. 29.; Tit. i. 5.; Philip. i. 1; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2.; and he finally concludes, that Popish Bishops are not true Bishops.

mischief." This furious enthusiast was born at Birdsall, in Yorkshire, and was entered of St. John's College, Cambridge. In 1612, he was incorporated Master of Arts at Oxford, and afterwards proceeded Bachelor of Divinity[1]. He was at first employed as tutor to the sons of Lord Carey, afterwards Earl of Monmouth, and through the interest of that nobleman, he was promoted to be Clerk of the Closet to Henry, Prince of Wales, and, after his death, to Prince Charles. He was appointed in 1623, to attend the Prince into Spain, but this appointment was cancelled, for reasons unknown, after his luggage had been shipped. He did not forget this disappointment, but probably he would have remained in silence had his ambition been gratified: for, on Charles' accession, he was mortally offended at not being continued Clerk of the Closet,—Dr. Neile, Bishop of Durham, who had filled that office under James I. being continued. These two disappointments excited his hatred, and he revenged himself by a continual course of opposition and abuse to the Church. In 1625, he was dismissed the Court, for some misdemeanour, and for presuming to write a letter to the King, charging Bishops Neile and Laud as inclined to Popery. About the same time he was presented to the rectory of St. Matthew's, Friday Street, London, but the date of his institution is not known. Being leagued

[1] Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. i. col. 192, 207. Fuller, book xi. p. 152.

with the Puritan faction through mere revenge; (for he afterwards became a furious Independent, and opposed his quondam associates Prynne and Bastwick, who were as furious in their Presbyterian notions;) he made the pulpit of St. Matthew's the place for vaunting his puritanical extravagances, and became one of the most violent factionists of his party. In 1624 he began to publish his opinions; and his works, which are seventy in number, are enumerated in the Bodleian Catalogue, and by the industrious Antony Wood. These have in general the quaint and ludicrous titles for which the Puritan rhapsodies were so much distinguished. His first work is "A censure of Simony," London, 1624. 2. "A Plea to an Appeal, traversed Dialogue wise." 1626. 3. "The Baiting of the Pope's Bull," 1627. 4. "Trial of Private Devotions, or a Dyal for the House of Prayer," 1628. 5. "Israel's Fasts," 1628. 6. "Seven Vials," 1628. 6. "Babel no Bethel, or the Church of Rome no true visible Church of Christ." 7. "Truth's Triumph over Trent," 1629, &c. &c[1].

Burton had been always known as a factious zealot, but it was not till the year 1636 that he became remarkable. On the 5th of November, he preached two sermons in St. Matthew's Church, which he afterwards published, entitled, "For God and the King," for which he was summoned in

[1] Lord Clarendon, vol. i. p. 200. Wood, ut sup. col. 635; and Fasti, col. 192. Bodleian Catalogue, vol. i.

December before the Commissioners for ecclesiastical causes. The oath being tendered to him *ex officio*, he refused to take it, and appealed to the King. This served him nothing, for the same commission soon after met at Doctors Commons, by whom he was suspended and deprived of his benefice. He thought it expedient after this to conceal himself in his own house, and he published his sermons with an apology.

These sermons were founded on Prov. xxiv. 22. and are in the same style as the effusions of his associates Prynne and Bastwick. He assails the bishops, whom, instead of fathers, he styles *step-fathers*, caterpillars instead of pillars, whose houses are haunted, and their episcopal chairs poisoned, by the spirit that bears rule in the air. "They are," he says, "the limbs of the beast, even of Antichrist, taking his very courses to bear and beat down the hearing of the word of God, whereby men might be saved. Their fear is more towards an altar of their own invention, an image or crucifix, the sound and syllable of Jesus, than towards the Lord Christ. They are miscreants, traps and wiles of the dragon dogs; like flattering tales, new Babel-builders. Blind watchmen, dumb dogs, thieves, robbers of souls, false prophets, ravening wolves, factors for Antichrist, anti-christian mush-rumps." He then clamours about Popery, which he flatly charges the bishops with attempting to introduce,—that the spirit of Rome breathes in them—that they wish "to wheel about to their

Roman mistress,"—that they are confederated with "priests and Jesuits to rear up that religion." And, therefore, in his Apology, which being published at his leisure, makes his sedition or treason the more notorious, they are styled "jesuited poly-pragmatics, and sons of Belial." Dr. White, Bishop of Ely, is charged with railing, perverting, and fighting against truth. The learned Montague of Chichester, is "a tried champion of Rome, and devoted votary of the queen of heaven:" Wren, of Norwich, meets with no quarter from this Puritan Rabshekah; and, finally, he falls upon the Archbishop, upon whom he bestows plentiful abuse, and declares, "that he had a papal infallibility of spirit, whereby, as by a divine oracle, all questions in religion are finally determined." — "These," says Heylin, who quotes numerous other expressions, "are the principal flowers of rhetoric which grew in the garden of Henry Burton, sufficient, without doubt, to shew how sweet a champion he was likely to prove of the Church and Gospel."

These extracts require little comment. When we reflect, that instead of calling sinners to repentance, and expounding the Scriptures faithfully, those Puritan enthusiasts used the pulpit as a place from which to utter their scandalous invectives; that the holy office of prayer was prostituted in their extemporaneous effusions; that they harangued their hearers continually on topics of the like nature, and thereby stimulated to sedition and rebellion—no language is too strong in reprobation of these men.

And this is not a rare case. No: frequently did they indulge in the same licentiousness of speech: hardly was there an exception; and every one, more or less, according to his natural temper, indulged in seditious language. All were deep politicians: like their brethren in Scotland, they were literally so many popes—the pulpit constantly resounded with their slander and abuse. Nor were they content with thundering their invectives against a general system; they descended to personalities; held up individuals to public ridicule and odium against whom they indulged private hatred. Was this preaching the gospel? Will the modern admirer of those enthusiasts, whether he be sectarian or not, whether he looks with admiration on English Puritans, or zealots not less dangerous, Scottish Covenanters—will he assert, that this was in accordance with that religion, about the purity of which they clamoured so violently? But is it not clear, that the men who could preach and write this insufferable sedition, had other objects in view than their alleged defence of gospel truth? Religion and liberty were indeed their pretexts; the former, of a truth, entitled to all reverence, the latter to all regard; but will it be said that they were animated by those noble objects, who dared to profane the Christian temple by their unhallowed hatred towards men whose opinions were, to say the least, entitled to as much reverence as their own; to exasperate when they could not otherwise vanquish; or shall that law, severe as it confessedly was, be

utterly condemned, which silenced the incendiaries in the midst of their foul upbraidings? It is, indeed, indisputable, that the Puritans had all along revolved their plans; they wished from the first to obtain the mastery; they were all the factious spirits, whose march of mind was stopt in its career by the domination of unruly passions—men, whose craftiness or hypocrisy was proportionable to the desire for that ascendancy which they wished to obtain.

On the 1st of February, 1636-7, a Sergeant-at-Arms, with several attendants, having a warrant from the Star-Chamber, forcibly entered Burton's house, searched his study, and carried him off to prison. The following day, by order of the Privy Council, he was conveyed to the Fleet, where he was closely confined several weeks. Here, instead of moderating his conduct, he farther insulted the government, by writing "An Epistle to his Majesty," a second "to the Judges," and a third to the "true-hearted Nobility." For these, and the two sermons before mentioned, an information was laid against him on the 11th of March.

It appears from Rushworth, that all the Judges met at Sergeant's Inn, together with the King's Counsel, to consider whether these writings did not amount to high treason. The Judges agreed, however, in the absence of the Counsel, that nothing could be high treason, unless charged on the 25th Edward III. This opinion was delivered by the Lord Chief Justice to the King and Council, and it

remained undecided, till at length it was resolved to proceed against them in the Star Chamber[1].

After an interval of several days, the cause came on at Trinity Term, when Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton, were severally charged with "printing and publishing seditious, schismatical, and libellous books against the hierarchy of the Church, and to the scandal of the government[2]." Prynne, however, fearing, or pretending to fear, that they would not have liberty to reply to the information; after having drawn up, with his companions, some answers, which were in themselves so scurrilous that no counsellor would sign them, as was customary in the court, exhibited a cross information against the Archbishop and others, in which they were charged "with usurping his Majesty's prerogative royal, with innovations in religion, licensing of Popish and Arminian books," and other imaginary *crimes;* but this information being signed solely by themselves, it was refused by Lord Keeper Coventry as inadmissible. A variety of exceptions were now made by the defendants: they desired that they might have their answers signed with their own hands, according to the ancient custom of the court, and that they then would abide its censure. In fine, after having had six weeks allowed them to prepare their answers, and having neglected so to do, they were held as *pro confessis;* and Burton's

[1] Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. p. 324.

[2] Rushworth, ut sup. p. 380. "A New Discovery of the Prelates' Tyranny," 4to. 1641. p. 17, &c.

obstinacy in particular was reckoned self-conviction. On the 14th of June, sentence was passed upon them: Prynne, the most inveterate offender, was condemned to be fined 5000*l.* to lose the remainder of his ears in the pillory, to be branded in both cheeks with the initials of Slanderous Libeller, and to be imprisoned for life in Caernarvon Castle. Bastwick and Burton were sentenced to pay the same fine, and were to lose their ears in the pillory, to be imprisoned, the one in Launceston and the other in Lancaster Castles. Prynne and Bastwick had already been degraded in their several professions; Burton was also degraded from the ministerial functions, his benefice forfeited, his degrees at the University rescinded, writing materials were prohibited to him, and he was to have no communication with any individual except his jailor [1].

The defendants, and particularly Bastwick, protested against this censure. He alleged that he could not justly be taken *pro confesso,* charged his counsel with timidity, as being afraid to sign his answer, lest they should offend the prelates, and still offered it signed by himself, which was of course refused. "My Lords," said he, "I most humbly beseech your honours to accept of it, for it is pretended that it is taken *pro confesso,* as if we had failed on our parts, either out of contempt to the

[1] Fuller, ut sup. book xi. p. 152—155. Collier, vol. ii. p. 771, 772. Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 382. Whitelock's Memorials, p. 22. New Discovery of the Prelates' Tyranny, p. 40, &c. Lansdowne MSS. 493.

order, or negligence, both of which on my part, I am free from: and if your honours will refuse it, then I protest before men and angels this day, that I will put this answer of mine in Roman buff [Latin] and send it throughout the whole Christian world, that all men may see my innocency, and your illegal proceedings, and this I shall do though I die for it." He then threw the paper into court, and, after the Lord Keeper remarking that he was determined to let the court have his answer, he proceeded, "I shall presume to say to your honours, as St. Paul spake unto the Centurion, when they were about to whip him, What, saith he, will you whip a Roman? So, my good Lords, let me say to your honours, What, will you cut off a true and loyal subject's ears, for doing his duty towards his King and country? Will you cut off a scholar's ears? Will you cut off a Doctor of Physic's ears, able to cure lords, peers, kings, and emperors? Will you cut off a Christian's ears? Will you make curs of Christians, my Lords? Will you cut off a Catholic, Apostolic, a Roman's ears? Men, brethren, and fathers, what an age do we live in, to be exposed to the merciless fury of every malignant spirit!"

The Archbishop had been grossly attacked, along with the other prelates, and his speech on this occasion is happily preserved, having been commanded to be printed a few days after the censure by the King [1], and it is perhaps unequalled for its

[1] Diary, p. 54.

masterly eloquence and temperate spirit[1]. "And first," says he, in his Dedication to the King, "for my own profession, I humbly beg your Majesty to think, that Burton hath not in this many followers, and I am heartily sorry he should take the lead. The best is, your Majesty knows what made his rancour swell. I will say no more[2]. And for the law, I truly honour it with all my heart, and believe Prynne may seek all the Inns of Court, (and with a candle, too, if he will,) and scarce find such a malevolent as himself against Church and State. Frequently hath he thrust law into those pamphlets, to wrong the governors of the Church, and abuse your good and well-disposed people, and he makes Burton and Bastwick utter law, which, God knows, they understand not, for I doubt his pen is in all the Pamphlets. And for physic, the profession is honourable and safe, and I know the possessors of it will remember that *corpus humanum* is that about which their art is conversant, not *corpus ecclesiasticum* or *politicum*. But the proverb in the Gospel is all I will say to him, *Medice, cura teipsum;* and yet, let me tell your Majesty, I believe he hath gained more by making the Church a patient, than by all the patients he ever had beside.

[1] A Speech delivered at the Star Chamber, on Wednesday, the 14th day of June, 1637, at the censure of John Bastwick, Henry Burton, and William Prynne, concerning pretended innovations in the Church, by the Most Rev. &c. 4to. London. 1637.

[2] The Archbishop here alludes to Burton's revenge on account of his disappointment in court favour.

Both myself and my brethren have been very coarsely treated by the tongues and pens of these men, yet shall I never give your Majesty any evil counsel. I shall rather magnify your clemency, that proceeded with these offenders in a court of mercy as well as justice, since, as the reverend judge then declared, you might have justly called the offenders into another court, and put them to it in a way that might have exacted their lives for their stirring, as much as in them lay, mutiny and sedition."

The whole speech, which occupies seventy-seven pages, it is unnecessary to lay before the reader. One or two quotations, however, I here adduce. "There were times," says the Archbishop, "when persecutions were great in the Church, even to exceed barbarity itself. Did any martyr or confessor in those times libel the governors? Not one of them, to the best of my remembrance. Yet these men complain of persecution, without any shew of cause, and in the mean time libel and rail without measure. So little of kin are they to those who suffer for Christ, or the least part of Christian religion. My lords, I can say it clearly and surely, as in the presence of God, I have done nothing as a prelate, to the uttermost of which I am conscious, but with a single heart, and with a sincere intention for the good government and honour of the Church, and the maintenance of the orthodox truth and religion of Christ professed, established, and maintained in this Church of England. For my care of

this Church, the reducing of it to order, the upholding of the etxernal worship of God in it, and the settling of it to the rules of its first reformation, are the causes, and the sole causes, whatever else is pretended, of all this malicious storm which hath lowered so black upon me, and some of my brethren. And in the mean time, they who are the only, or the chief, innovators of the Christian world, have nothing to say, accuse us of innovation; they themselves and their accomplices being actually the greatest innovators that the Christian world hath ever known. I deny not that others have spread more dangerous errors in the Church of Christ; but no men, in any age of it, have been more guilty of innovation than they, while they cry out against it, *Quis tulerit Gracchos?* And I shall say, *Quis tulerit Gracchos?* for it is most apparent to any man who will not wink the matter, that the intention of these men and their abettors, was and is to cause a sedition, being as great incendiaries in the State as they have ever been in the Church, when they get power. Our main crime is, (would they all speak out, as some of them do) that we are bishops. Were we not so, some of us might be as passable as other men. And a great trouble it is to them that we maintain our calling as bishops to be *jure divino*. Enough has already been said in Leighton's case, only it may be here remarked, that this calling is *jure divino*, though not all the adjuncts to the calling. And this I say, in direct opposition to the Church of Rome, as well as to the

Puritan humour. And I say farther, that from the Apostles' times, in all ages, and in all places, the Church of Christ was governed by Bishops, and lay elders never heard of till Calvin's new-fangled decree at Geneva. Now, this is made by these men as if it were *contra regem*, in right or power. But that is an ignorant shift; for our being bishops, *jure divino*, takes nothing from the king's right or power over us. For though our office be from God and Christ immediately, yet we cannot exercise our office either of order or jurisdiction, but as God hath appointed us, that is, not in his Majesty's or in any Christian King's kingdoms, but by and under the power of the King given us so to do. And were the argument against us valid, as bishops, it must also be so against priests and ministers, for they themselves grant that their calling is *jure divino*, and yet I hope they will not say that to be priests and ministers is against the King or any of his royal prerogatives.

"But, suppose our calling as bishops could not be made good *jure divino*, yet, *jure ecclesiastico*, it cannot be denied. And here, in England, the bishops are confirmed both in their power and revenues by Acts of Parliament, so that we stand in as good condition as the laws of England can make us, and so we must stand till the laws shall be repealed, by the same power that made them. Therefore, supposing we had no other argument (I say, suppose this, but I grant it not), yet no man can libel our calling, as these men do, be it from

the pulpit, in print, or otherwise, but he libels the King and the State by whose laws we are established. All these libels, then, so far as they are against our office, are also against the King and the law, and can have no other purpose than to stir up the people to sedition. If these men had any other intentions, or if they had any Christian or charitable desire to reform any thing amiss, why did they not modestly petition his Majesty about it, that in his princely wisdom, he might set all things right in a quiet and orderly manner. For one clamours from the pulpit, and all of them from the press, and, in a most virulent and unchristian manner, set themselves to make a heat among the people, and so by mutiny to effect that which by law they cannot, and by most false and unjust calumnies to defame both our office and persons. But for my part, I pity their rage, and heartily pray God to forgive their malice.

"No nation hath ever appeared more jealous of religion than the people of England, and their zeal for God's glory hath been, as it is to this day, their great honour. But the main tendency of these libels is to kindle a jealousy in men's minds that there are some great plots in hand, *dangerous plots*, as Burton says expressly, to change the orthodox religion established in England, and to bring in I know not what Romish superstition in its room, as if the external worship of God could not be withheld in this kingdom without introducing Popery. Now, by this device of theirs, allow

me to say, that the King is most desperately abused and wounded in the minds of his people, and the prelates shamefully. *The King most desperately,* for there is not a more cunning trick in the world to withdraw the hearts of the people from their sovereign, than to persuade them that he is changing true religion, and about to introduce gross superstition; *and the prelates shamefully,* for they are charged as seducing, laying the plot, and the instruments."

The Archbishop, after exonerating the King, thus proceeds, "And for the prelates, I assure myself they cannot be so base, as to live prelates in the Church of England, and labour to introduce the superstitions of the Church of Rome. And if any should be so base, I do not only leave him to God's judgments, but, (if these libellers, or any others, can discover his base and irreligious conduct) to shame also, and punishment from the State; and no man's hand shall be sooner raised against him than mine shall be. But for myself, to pass over all the scandalous reproaches which they have most injuriously cast upon me, I say this only. *First,* I know of no plot, nor purpose of altering the established religion. *Secondly,* I have always been far from attempting such a thing that may truly be said to tend that way in the least degree, and to these two I here offer my oath. *Thirdly,* if the King had a mind to change his religion, which I know he hath not, and God forbid he should ever have, he must seek for other instruments; for as

basely as these men conceive of me, I thank God, I know my duty well, both to God and the King: and I know that all the duty I owe to the King is under God: and my great happiness it is (though not mine alone) to live under a gracious and a religious King, who duly appreciates the service of God. But were the days otherwise, I thank Christ, I yet know not how to serve any man against the truth of God; and this I trust I shall never learn[1]."

Such is a specimen of this truly eloquent oration, which, when compared with the fanatical rhapsodies of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton, the intolerance and revenge which breathe throughout their Puritan effusions, cannot fail to be admitted as a noble testimony to the honour, piety, and integrity of this noble prelate. He proceeds in the same masterly style, making use of his great learning, in refuting the alleged innovations of those enthusiasts, in which he proves to a demonstration the malevolence and folly of the charges. There is one thing, however, which must not be omitted. The Archbishop has got all the odium for the sentence of those enthusiasts, and sectarians have reprobated his memory as if he had been the original proposer of it. This, however, is not the fact. He was merely a member of the court, he delivered his speech in vindication of himself, but he did not deliver an opinion in the court; he did not openly coincide

[1] Speech in the Star-Chamber, ut sup. p. 2—15. Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 383—385, and Appendix.

with the sentence, whatever he may have privately thought. He expressly says, in the last paragraph of the said speech: "But because the business hath some reflection upon myself, *I shall forbear to censure* them, and leave them to God's mercy and the King's justice [1]." In confirmation of this, though the sentence produced, in the year 1641, "A new Discovery of the Prelates' Tyranny in their late prosecutions of Mr. William Prynne, Dr. John Bastwick, and Mr. Henry Burton," from the pen of Prynne, in which he charges the Archbishop and others with the sentence,—though in his "Canterburie's Doome," written by the same Prynne, and published in 1646, it is asserted, that the censure of the three enthusiasts was by "Laud's prosecution, for opposing his Popish innovations [2];" yet it is evident that he acted merely as a private member of the court, and even refrained from expressing his opinion. For, first, setting aside the Archbishop's express declaration in the speech, which is surely as much entitled to credit as the opposite one of men supersaturated with malevolence, I find, in an account of the trial preserved among the Lansdowne MSS. [3] that the Archbishop spoke not a single word to the prisoners, and nothing except the Speech, because "the business had some reflection on himself," and the discourse was principally carried on between them and the Lord Chief Jus-

[1] Speech, ut sup. p. 77.

[2] Canterburie's Doome, p. 110—114. 488—497. 513—520.

[3] Lansdowne MSS. 493.

tice Finch, the Lord Keeper Coventry, Lord Dorset, Lord Arundell, Lord Carey, and Lord Cottington. Secondly, though they aver that they were prohibited from speaking in defence, I find in the same authority, the following address to Prynne, by the Lord Keeper: "Mr. Prynne, the business of this day is to proceed against you that are prisoners at the bar, and lest you should say that you had no liberty to speak, the court will give you leave to speak what you can in your defence, and they will hear you, if you keep within the bounds of modesty, and from libellous speeches," and they all answered "that they hoped so to order their speeches that they should be free from libels." But what was the consequence? No sooner had Prynne commenced than he opened with a libel; Bastwick began his defence with this rhapsody, "My honourable lords, methinks you look like an assembly of gods, ye are called the sons of God;" and he ended in violent declamation. Burton began a discourse in vindication, of which the following is the recital. "Mr. Burton," said the Lord Keeper, "what say you?" "My good lords," replied Burton, "your honours, it should seem, do determine to censure us, and take our cause *pro confesso*, although we have laboured to give your honours satisfaction in all things. My lords, what have you to say against my book? I confess I did write it, yet did I not any thing out of intent of commotion or sedition. I delivered nothing but what my text led me to say, being chosen to suit with the day, namely, the

5th of November, the words were these"—Here he was stopped by the Lord Keeper, who told him that there was no necessity to name texts of scripture, nor was he sent for to preach, but to answer those things objected against him. A conversation then ensued, after which he was asked, if he were guilty or not, and he declared that, as a minister, he had a right to say what he pleased in the pulpit; he denied that a minister ought always to proceed in a milder strain: "I being the pastor of my people," quoth he, "whom I had in charge, and was to instruct, I supposed it was my duty to inform them of those innovations that *are crept* into the Church, as also of the danger and ill consequences of them." Thirdly, I find in an account of the same proceedings preserved among the Harleian MSS. professedly written by one of their friends, and entitled, "A Briefe Relation of certayne speciall and most materiall passages and speeches in the Starre Chamber, occasioned and delivered June the 14th, 1637, at the censure of those three *worthy gentlemen,* Dr. Bastwicke, Mr. Burton, and Mr. Prynne, as it hath beene truely and faythfully gathered from their owne mouthes *by one present at the sayed censure*[1]," that the Archbishop is not mentioned at all, as interfering. Fourthly, it appears that Lord Cottington proposed the general sentence, and that the Lord Chief Justice Finch added the branding of Prynne as his

[1] Harleian MSS. 6865.

additional punishment, being the most inveterate offender, and to this censure "all the court agreed [1]." And lastly, the Archbishop expressly declared at his own trial, and it was not refuted, "In the giving of this sentence I spake my conscience, and was commanded to print my speech, *but I gave no vote*, because they had fallen so personally upon me, that I doubted many men might think that spleen and not justice had induced me [2]." Finally, though Bastwick, in the edition of his book which he calls, "Eleuchus," printed at London 1648, rails against the Archbishop, it is evident that it proceeded more from hatred to the Church of England in general, than from any real evidence that Laud was his persecutor; and the reader will moreover recollect, that no man was more grossly abused than was the Archbishop in the "Letany," published by this Medico-Mastix.

Indeed, Prynne knew all this well; for though he has the assurance, common indeed to his faction, to charge the Archbishop with the whole proceedings, saying, that he and his two associates "were brought into the Star Chamber by the Archbishop's prosecution, and there most inhumanly censured for opposing his Popish innovations,"—that "the books for which they were censured were neither scandalous, seditious, nor schismatical,"—that "their prosecution proceeded principally from him,"—and,

[1] Lansdowne MSS. 493. Harleian MSS. 6865.

[2] Troubles and Trials, p. 144, 145.

above all, that the questioning for these books "was originally his act alone, not the court's, which did nought in it but by his instigation[1]," with innumerable other falsehoods and misrepresentations, yet, had not his vindictive passions blinded his judgment, or made him forget the truth, he could not fail to be conscious that he was uttering falsehoods. For the court expressly declared the act as their own, by Lord Keeper Coventry, who, when Prynne demanded that the prelates should be removed from the court, "because we know," said he, "they are our adversaries, and it is neither agreeable to nature, reason, nor justice, that those who are our adversaries should be our judges."—"In good faith," replied the Lord Keeper, "it is a sweet notion, is it not? Herein you are become libellous, and if you should thus libel all the honourable lords, all the reverend judges, as you do the most reverend bishops, by this your plea, you would leave none to pass sentence upon you for libelling, because *they are all parties*[2]." Again, the same Prynne charges Laud with having advised the court to hold them *pro confessis*, whereas he well knew that they had six weeks to prepare their defence, and that the Lord Keeper informed them of a case in which the party had only six days, which, being neglected, the parties were held *pro confessis*. He charges the Archbishop with having

[1] Canterburie's Doome, p. 110. 496. 517.

[2] Lansdowne MSS. 493.

stimulated the Lord Keeper to reject the cross bill exhibited against him; whereas, if he knew any thing of law at all, he could not be ignorant that the court was not bound to depart from established usage for his convenience, to admit cross bills, or answers not regularly filed by counsel. He asserts, that the Archbishop was not only "the cause and contriver" of the sentence "before it was given," but that "he approved and thanked the Lords for it in his speech, when it was given:" whereas, first, the speech was delivered, no doubt, before the sentence was pronounced; but he expressly declared, he would *not* censure them, because the business had some reflection upon himself; and, secondly, if he had read the speech, published that very year, on the 25th of June, he did not *thank the Lords*, but merely observes, "I humbly crave your Lordships' pardon for my unnecessary length, and give *you* all hearty thanks for your noble patience, and your just and honourable sentence upon these men, and *your unanimous dislike* of them, and defence of the Church." In short, the same Prynne, after writing these and similar passages, completes his falsehoods by actually acknowledging, in the same breath, that the Archbishop *gave no vote on the censure itself*[1].

On Friday, the 30th of June, those "three libellers," as the Archbishop terms them, underwent their sentences; and, as their behaviour exhibits a

[1] Canterburie's Doome, p. 496.

strange compound of fanaticism and obstinacy, their speeches are worthy of notice. The punishment took place in the presence of a vast concourse of spectators, for though, as the noble historian writes, "none of them was in interest or any esteem with the worthy part of their several professions, having been formerly all looked upon under characters of reproach," yet, "when they were all sentenced, and for the execution of that sentence brought out to be punished, as common and signal rogues, exposed upon scaffolds, to have their ears cut off, and their faces and foreheads branded with hot irons, men began no more to consider their manners, but the men." To the same effect Heylin has an appropriate remark. "It was a great trouble to the spirits of many moderate and well meaning men, to see the three most eminent professions in all the world, divinity, law, and physic, so wretchedly dishonoured in the persons of the malefactors, as was observed by the Archbishop himself, in his epistle to the King." It appears, from the account in the Harleian MSS. already referred to, that the multitude "came with tender affections to behold those three *renowned soldiers* and *servants of Jesus Christ,* who came with undaunted and magnanimous courage thereunto, having their way strewed with sweet herbs, from the house out of which they came to the pillory, with all the honour that could be done unto them."

Bastwick appeared first, and, meeting with Burton, he embraced him, rejoicing that they had both

met at such a place, and on such an occasion. Their enthusiasm, as may be easily conceived, amounted almost to madness, and they really imagined themselves elevated among the saints and martyrs of old; so easy is it to make enthusiasm subservient to prejudice, and to assume a merit for suffering even in a bad cause. Prynne appeared last, and was saluted by his two companions in the same manner. Bastwick's wife attended him, and, kissing her when he mounted the scaffold, "Farewell, my dearest," said he, "be of good comfort. I am nothing dismayed[1]."

Bastwick commenced a most singular speech. "There are many," said he, "that are this day spectators of our standing here as delinquents, though not delinquents. We bless God for it. I am not conscious to myself wherein I have committed the least trespass, to take this outward shame, either against my God or my King. The first occasion of my troubles was by the prelates for writing a book against the Pope, and the Pope of Canterbury said, I wrote against him, and therefore questioned me; but if the press were as open to us as formerly it has been, we would shatter his kingdom about his ears. But be ye not deterred by their power, neither be affrighted at our sufferings. I know there are many here who have set many days apart for our behalf, (let the prelates take notice of it), and they have sent up strong

[1] Harleian MSS. 6865.

prayers for us to heaven: we feel the strength and benefit of them at this time. In a word, so far I am from fear, base fear, or caring for any thing they can do, or cast upon me, that had I as much blood as would swell the Thames, I would shed it every drop in this cause. This plot of sending us to remote places was first consulted and agitated by the Jesuits, as I can make it plainly appear. O see what times we are fallen into, that the Lords must sit to act the Jesuits' plots. For our own parts, we owe no malice to the persons of any of the prelates, but would lay our necks under their feet to do them good as they are men, but against their usurpations, as they are bishops, we do profess ourselves enemies till doomsday[1]."

In this seditious speech, the latter part of which is so opposite to Bastwick's sentiments, as expressed in the Litany, about the persons of the prelates, where he advises the King "to hang them all[2]," he is truly nothing daunted by the punishment: in his way of reasoning, however, to hang a man for being a bishop was no crime. Prynne followed next, and he professed to lay down the law of libel, as it was punished in the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth. He then began to abuse the Church, and attack the *jus divinum* of the Episcopal order. "I make the challenge," said he, "against all the

[1] Harleian MSS. 6865. Lansdowne MSS. 493. Fuller, book xi. p. 155. New Discovery of the Prelate's Tyranny, part ii. p. 34, 35.

[2] Litany, p. 15.

prelates in the King's dominions, and all Christendom, to maintain that their calling is *jure divino*. If I make it not good, let me be hanged up at the hall gate. You all see there be no degrees of men exempted from suffering. Here is a reverend divine for the soul, a physician for the body, and a lawyer for the estate. I had thought they would have let alone their own society, and not been misled with any of them. Gentlemen, look to yourselves, if all the martyrs that suffered in Queen Mary's days, are accounted and called schismatical heretics and factious fellows, what shall we look for?—and such factious fellows are we, for discovering a plot of Popery. Alas! poor England! what will become of thee, if thou look not the sooner into thine own privileges, and maintain not thine own lawful liberty?"

The executioner having come to Prynne to inflict the sentence, "Come," said the enthusiast, "come, friend, come: hew me: cut me. I fear not. I have learned to fear the fire of hell, and not what man can do unto me. Come, scar me, sear me. I shall bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." So close were his ears cut by the savage executioner, that a part of his cheek was taken away. Nevertheless, this intrepid man flinched not. "The more I am beat down," said he, "the more I am lifted up." He was courageous from his nature, while Bastwick was so from obstinacy, and Burton from fanaticism.

Burton conducted himself in a similar manner.

On account of his sacred profession, his censure was exceedingly unpopular. At his punishment there was great murmurings among the spectators[1]. He made a very long speech, extremely incoherent, and abounding in rhapsodies, the chief design of which was to establish a parallel between his sufferings and those of our Saviour. There were three pillories set up, and his happened to be the centre; before he was brought out, looking from the apartment into the Palace-Yard, he said, "Methinks I see Mount Calvary, where the three crosses, one for Christ, and the other two for the two thieves, were pitched." This was the height of enthusiasm: here he compares himself to Christ in language bordering on profaneness: his allusions, however, to the two other pillories, *crosses*, in his opinion, destined, in his religious allegory, for the *two thieves*, was no great compliment to his two associates in suffering, Bastwick and Prynne, more especially, if we observe his farther expressions, "If Christ," said he, "was numbered among thieves, shall a Christian for Christ's sake, think much to be numbered among *rogues*, such as we are condemned to be? Surely, if I be a rogue, I am Christ's rogue, and no man's." Turning to his wife, he said, "Wife, why art thou so sad?"—"Sweetheart," replied she, "I am not sad."—"No," said he, "see thou be not; for I would

[1] Garrard to Wentworth, July 24, 1637, apud Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. p. 85.

not have thee dishonour this day by shedding one tear, or fetching one sigh; for behold there for thy comfort, my triumphant chariot, on the which I must ride, for the honour of my Lord and Master. And never was my wedding day so welcome and joyful as this. And so much the more, because I have such a noble captain and leader, who hath gone before me with such undaunted courage, that he saith of himself, 'I gave my back to the smiters, my cheeks to the scoffers, they pluckt off the hair. I hide not my face from shame and spitting,' for the Lord God will help me." When he was put into the pillory, he exclaimed, "Shall I be ashamed of a pillory for Christ, who was not ashamed of a cross for me? Good people, I am brought hither to be a spectacle to the world, to angels, and men, and howsoever I stand here to undergo the punishment of a rogue, yet, except to be a faithful servant to Christ, and a loyal subject to the King, be the property of a rogue, I am no rogue. I glory in it." A bee happening to alight on a nosegay he held in his hand, "Do you not see this poor bee?" he exclaimed, "It hath found out this very place to suck sweetness from these flowers, and cannot *I suck sweetness from Christ?*" He then proceeded in a strain of enthusiasm to compare himself with Jesus Christ. One asked him if the pillory were not uneasy for his neck and shoulder. "How can Christ's yoke be uneasy," he replied: "this is Christ's yoke, and he bears the heavier end of it." At another time, on calling for a handkerchief, he

said, "It is hot, but Christ bore the burden in the heat of the day." With numbers of his friends he held conversation, who seem to have been all imbued with the same enthusiasm, and to have exulted in his extravagant expressions. One of the guards had a rusty halberd, the iron of which was fixed to the staff with an old crooked nail. "What an old rusty halberd is that," exclaimed one: to which Burton replied, "This seems to me to be one of those halberds which accompanied Judas when he went to betray his Master." A friend asked him, if he would have gladly dispensed with his suffering, "No, not for a world," was his reply[1].

After their sentence, those three unfortunate men were removed to prison[2]. Prynne, on the

[1] Harleian MSS. 6865. Lansdowne MSS. 493. New Discovery, &c. p. 46—56.

[2] On Prynne's return to the Tower by water, after the execution of the sentence, he composed the well-known distich, which is not wanting in beauty and poetical expression.

"Stigmata maxillis referens, insignia laudis,
Exultans remeo victima grata Deo."

It has been thus translated, (Biog. Brit. vol. vi. Part 2. p. 146.)

From suffering for my country I return,
Exulting in that cause to bleed and burn.

A Puritan poetaster, however, has favoured us with a different version. (Harleian MSS. 6865.)

S. L. Laud's scars.
Triumphant I returne, my face descryes
Laud's scorching scars, God's grateful sacrifice.

But the wit of this loses its effect. Prynne did not blame

27th of July, was sent to Mount Orgueil Castle, in the Island of Jersey, where he continued till he was released by the Long Parliament in 1640. Bastwick was sent to St. Mary's Castle, in the Island of Scilly, and Burton to Cormet Castle, in Guernsey. They both remained prisoners till the same period, when they were released by the said Parliament; their sentence reversed; reparation and damages awarded to them for their punishments, and 5000*l.* voted to Bastwick, and 6000*l.* to Burton, out of the estates of the Archbishop, the Bishop of London, the Earl of Arundell, the Earl of Pembroke, Sir Henry Vane, Sir John Cook, and Sir Francis Windebank, who had all signed the warrant in the Star Chamber. The ensuing disasters, however, prevented the payment of the money.

In commenting on these proceedings, it must not be denied that the punishments exceeded the offence, and that they are revolting to our modern opinions of the punishment for libel. But when we recollect the times, we shall be more cautious in expressing our condemnation. That it was a tragedy may be allowed; but all public punishments are tragical, because the unhappy persons are sufferers; but severity is a term liable to

Laud exclusively for the sentence. (Canterburie's Doome, p. 496.) And the motion for branding Prynne originated with Chief Justice Finch, (Lansdowne MSS. 493, &c.) Dr. Heylin is peculiarly happy in *his* motto prefixed to the Elegy on this great prelate, "*Dignum, Laude, virum musa vetat mori.*" Horat. lib. iv. 8.

various interpretations; the individuals, their influence, and the tendency which their actions is likely to have on society, must not be forgotten. The sentiments of Laud on this subject are indisputable, that the "King was most desperately abused," for "there is not a more cunning trick in the world to withdraw the hearts of the people from their sovereign, than to persuade them that he is changing true religion, and about to introduce gross superstition." The case is to the point: Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, were not only inveterate offenders and dangerous political fanatics, but they were sowers of sedition, they all intermeddled in subjects with which they had no concern; and their sedition was the more dangerous in that age of enthusiasm, as tending to estrange the affections of the people from their sovereign. And in every case where the sovereign and his ministers are treated with licentious freedom; where the institutions, whether sacred or civil, of the nation, are brought into contempt, and made the subject of unholy derision, slander, and abuse, the safety of the state requires an exemplary punishment. I hold, however, that no part of this sentence was severe, except the cutting off of the ears, which, it must not be forgotten at the same time, was the custom of the age, when the criminal law was not reduced to the modern established code; and, therefore, whatever may be the opinions of the present age on these transactions, we ought especially to guard against carrying all our existing prejudices and prevalent

customs into the history of the past, which many of our modern affectors of liberality and evangelism have yet to learn. No judgment can be formed on these grounds: no standard can be erected as a criterion; men were then only in advancing civilization; at the period of which I now write, a century had not elapsed since the national emancipation from the delusions and superstitions of Popery. That man is the most likely to discover truth, and to become the candid historian, who conceives himself living at the period he is attempting to delineate; and who delivers his investigations to posterity, unheated by party, divested of fanaticism, untainted with sectarian prejudices; not surely he who, like the Puritan Mastyx, plunges into the history of the past, furious, passionate, and revengeful; carrying with him his animosity and hatred to existing institutions, which even the hand of time has rendered sacred and national; and who is anxious to discover facts which will afford him an opportunity to utter his preconceived opinions. In the present case, one thing at least is certain, that the three political enthusiasts had their revenge. "As to the sufferers," observes Echard, "they gloried in what they had done and endured, and became more turbulent than ever; and Prynne became so implacably furious, that he never rested till he had taken off the Archbishop's head, ruined episcopacy, and involved the nation in the most dreadful confusion. But at length, having seen a thousand unexpected calamities, and growing weary of himself, when he

had in a manner no enemies to engage him, he began to look up, and to repent his former career, wishing, *that when they had cut off his ears, they had cut off his head.*"

Burton's extravagant language, however, must not be forgotten. It is indeed lamentable to observe the irreverence and profaneness with which the Puritans talked of the Supreme Being. Prynne had declared on one occasion that Christ was a Puritan. Here we have a man, one of their great predestinarian champions, publicly comparing his sufferings to those of Jesus Christ, and, to make the parallel complete, observing, that as our Saviour was crucified between two thieves, so was he punished between *two rogues.* His enthusiasm is revolting and daring; it is not the language of those holy men of old, nay, even of the holy martyrs of the English Church, to whose immortal names and glorious triumph every sincere member of the Episcopal Church, and indeed every true Christian, can point with reverence and deeply-cherished regard; but it is the language of that fanatical spirit resulting from dangerous notions of spiritual perfection; that enthusiasm which the Calvinistic dogma is so apt to engender respecting the perseverance of the saints, and the infallible certainty of individual election. In perusing this extravagant language, it would hardly be supposed that it could proceed from one who had so little of Christian love, as to rail against his fellow-men within the walls of the sanctuary, who was unquestionably an

offender against the laws of his country. Not one of the martyrs of old was ever so extravagant; not one of those whose deaths were embittered by every torment which pagan or popish cruelty could devise. But Burton had not so learned Christ. He exalts himself at once to the honours of martyrdom; he is pleased with the idea that "the day will never be forgotten[1]." How lamentable his language, and that too when he was suffering merely a temporary punishment, when there was no rack nor stake before his eyes; when, had he restrained the licentiousness of his tongue, he would never have been noticed; when, in short, his violent passions alone had exposed him to this puritan martyrdom!

The report of this punishment, aggravated by all the glosses which sectarian hatred and ingenuity could devise, quickly spread throughout the kingdom, and the bishops were most unjustly charged as the great abettors. The zealots took the opportunity to calumniate the Archbishop. "I had libel upon libel," he says, "scattered in the streets, and posted upon walls. Upon Friday, July 7, 1637, a note was brought to me of a sheet posted on the cross of Cheapside, that 'the arch-wolf of Canterbury had his hand in persecuting the saints, and shedding the blood of martyrs.' Now, what kind of saints and martyrs these were, may appear by their libellous writings; courses with which saints and

[1] Harleian MSS. 6865.

martyrs were never acquainted. And most certain it is, that howsoever the times went then, or go now, in Queen Elizabeth's time Penry was hanged, and Udal condemned and died in prison, for less than is contained in Burton's book, as will be evident to any one that compares their writings together; and these *saints* would have lost their lives had they done that in any other Christian state which they did against this[1]." The Presbyterians in Scotland, too, who in their zeal for covenanting, had already identified the English Puritans with themselves, practised with the latter in their hatred towards the Church[2]. For two months this libellous system was pursued. One libel was sent to the Archbishop by the Lord Mayor of London, which had been found at the south gate of St. Paul's, purporting that the devil had let that house to him. Two days afterwards another was brought to him, which had been posted on the north gate of St. Paul's, declaring, "that the government of the Church of England is a candle going out in a stench;" and on the same day, the Lord Mayor sent him another found in Cheapside, having his speech in the Star Chamber set in a pillory. Four days afterwards he received a poetical effusion of the like nature[3]. Such were the despicable practices of a faction to ruin a man by whom their extravagance and sedition had been often defeated.

[1] Diary, p. 54. History of Troubles and Trials, p. 145.
[2] Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 315. [3] Diary, p. 54, 55.

Another individual, a most furious zealot, was also punished at this period. This was the famous John Lilburne, a man, though poor, of a good family, infected with Puritanism from his youth, and afterwards Lieutenant Colonel in the rebellious army sanctioned by the Rump Parliament. He had been tutored, moreover, by Bastwick, whose Litany so captivated him, that he carried it over to Holland, and printed it there, and commenced libeller on his own account. He was also in the service of Prynne, and under such auspices he could not fail to improve in his puritanical enthusiasm. He was concerned in the printing and publishing of the "News from Ipswich;" he was tried for the same, and condemned to be whipt with one of his associates, Wharton, from the Fleet to Old Palace-Yard, Westminster, placed in the pillory for two hours, fined 500*l.* and obliged to find security for his good behaviour, and to be imprisoned in the Fleet till he conformed to the rules of Court. As his behaviour at his trial had procured for him the epithet of *Free-born John*, so his incorrigible obstinacy and insolence when undergoing the punishment, induced the Puritan zealots to bestow on him the title of Saint. During the punishment of whipping, he uttered fierce invectives against the Church: and when placed in the pillory, his hands being free, he scattered seditious pamphlets among the people. This induced the ministers of justice to bind him, and gag his mouth; but the zealot thereupon stamped with

his feet, to manifest his unconquerable hatred. In the prosecution of this fanatic, however, Archbishop Laud had no concern. He was imprisoned till the Long Parliament began: and from the time of his enlargement, until the day of his death in 1657, he exhibited all that diversity of character in politics and religion, which characterized the Puritan leaders. He became a Leveller, a Modeller, in every thing a ringleader, as violent an opposer to Cromwell as he had been to the King,— a declared enemy "to the powers that be," whatever they were, a violent incendiary, and at last he died a Quaker, after a life of singular vicissitudes. This enthusiast, in short, "had the inveterate spirit of contradiction,—an antichristian temper which no pretence of honesty, justice, or a good cause, can vindicate."

But the most remarkable prosecution, and one with which I shall close the proceedings of this year, remains to be noticed. This was the prosecution of Bishop Williams, though, from what has been already said concerning him, it is impossible at present to enter into detail. This statesman had long been in disgrace, and the King and the Archbishop entertained towards him an insuperable dislike. His own conduct had induced this feeling. His former life had been one of courtly favours, and his connexion with a noble family had opened to him many advantages. But great as was his genius and aspiring ambition, his mind was subtle and insidious, and many questioned his honesty

from his political craftiness. He evidently wanted the manly sincerity of the Archbishop, who knew not how to flatter, or to act against the dictates of his conscience.

In proof of these remarks, I would direct the reader's attention to several facts in the political life of Bishop Williams, to shew that he frequently adopted the Jesuitical maxim, that the end justifies the means, and that his subtlety and inclination to intrigue at times led him into glaring inconsistences. In the first place, his due regard for his own interest must not be forgotten. When he was Bishop of Lincoln, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, Dean of Westminster, Chaunter of Lincoln, Rector of Dinam, Walgrove, and Grafton, prebend of Peterborough, Nonnington, with three other benefices, which made Dr. Heylin aptly remark, that he was a perfect diocese within himself, he actually applied to the Duke of Buckingham for the Bishopric of London [1], and soon afterwards, on occasion of Abbot's misfortune in Bramzal Park, he applied for the primacy [2]. It must be admitted, however, that in some respects he had reason to wish for his removal, if the account which he has himself given be correct; for in a letter to the Duke of Buckingham he says, "My charge is exceeding great, my revenues very little: my bishopric, deanery, and other commendaries, do not clear unto me above a thousand a year at the utmost." He also declares that his

[1] Cabala, p. 54, 55. [2] Ibid. p. 56.

office as Lord Keeper had not produced him "one shilling these two years past [1]." But, in the second place, his intrigues and servility were notorious: we find him grossly flattering Buckingham: he wished to have no honours but what came from him; he declares himself his vassal: he lives only in the Duke's favour: the Duke's enemies and friends are his: in short, he resolves to regulate himself by the movements of his patron [2].

Dr. Williams succeeded the illustrious Bacon as Lord Keeper, and his ambitious character soon began to appear. "His spirit," says Pennant, "grew beyond the control of ministers; for, with undaunted courage, he persisted in all that was right, and being subject to the failings of his country, great pride, passion, and vanity, sometimes in what was wrong [3]." This writer adds, that "he always resisted the unreasonable demands of Buckingham," but in this few, I conceive, will agree with him; for if the preceeding quotations from the "Cabala" be correct, no minister could be more intriguing and selfish. But it is not probable the man who could counsel his sovereign, that "a King had a public and private conscience," as he did in the case of Strafford, whom he cordially hated, *could* be a *wise* minister, and a good man. He has been charged with an inclination to Puritanism, and as being a promoter of that party; so far as he loved the faction, the charge is groundless, but

[1] Cabala, p. 85. [2] Ibid. p. 83—85. 88. 94. 100—103. 107.
[3] Pennant's Tour in Wales, vol. ii. p. 309.

unquestionably, after his disgrace, he patronised their extravagances, not from inclination, but because it gratified his prejudices against Archbishop Laud.

Williams, however, was an eminent prelate, but no two characters could be more dissimilar than those of Williams and Laud, and unhappily they did not understand each other till it was too late. Both great and aspiring, their dissensions increased with their years, and at length ripened into mutual aversion. But Williams, whose conduct towards Laud had been always distinguished for regard to his own interest, loses by the comparison. His temper was complying and insinuating; and he was too often governed by circumstances, making his private inclinations subservient to the times. Laud was of a different disposition: his was an unchanging policy, to lay down the law, and to make men obedient to it; not to bend the law to the factious and turbulent dispositions of men. The former imagined that persuasion was the best method with the Puritans: the latter understood them better, and knew them to be men beyond the reach of argument or reason; which induced him to insist on compulsion and authority. "Laud," says Archdeacon Echard, "was like a bold pilot who would steer his vessel directly into harbour, though there were many rocks and shoals in the way: but Williams knew better how to avoid those hazardous places, and by proper windings and turnings, could more safely arrive in the harbour. Laud's rigid honesty made him fit for

primitive times, but Williams' policy taught him how to manage the infirmities of his own: the one being fit to govern saints, the other to deal with men, which is the more difficult task. To conclude all in the language of the Scriptures, which is proper for the characters of churchmen, Laud had always the innocence of the dove, but not so much of the wisdom of the serpent; Williams had very much of the latter, but we have reason to fear not the full perfection of the former."

It is impossible, however, to go into detail at present in the proceedings of this trial. Archbishop Laud has noted in his Diary, that Dr. Williams was censured in the Star Chamber on the 11th of July, for tampering and corrupting of witnesses in the King's cause; in other words, he was tried for revealing the King's secrets on the information of Sir John Lamb and Dr. Sibthorpe; for scandalous language reflecting on the King and his ministers; and for refusing to pay the tax of ship money, which had been levied to pay the expences of the navy; which complaint had been lodged against him in 1636, by the High Sheriff of Huntingdonshire.

The prosecution for revealing the King's secrets, contrary to his oath as a privy councillor, had been commenced against Bishop Williams in 1627, but he had contrived to stop or delay the proceedings for ten years by shifts and evasions. The Attorney-General, fearing a defeat in the evidence, set aside this charge, and preferred a new bill against him for tampering with the King's witnesses, on

which bill he was condemned. The trial excited great interest, and the Archbishop delivered a speech on the occasion. In this speech he declared his sorrow that the Bishop of Lincoln had been found to deserve the censure of the court; that he was grieved for this on account of his profession, on account of the speculation which it would excite among the enemies of the Church, and on account of his own great abilities. He declared that five several times he had made intercession to the King for him on his knees. "I delivered for him," said the Archbishop, "several petitions myself into the King's own hand, and I then did that which, had I known what now I do, I should not have done; I sent him under my own hand the King's answers upon every petition. And after all these five several services, I must tell you, my Lords, I was but coarsely dealt withal, nay, ill-requited. Yet was I overcome to move again at Christmas last, and I have it under his own hand, or if his secretary wrote the letter, his own hand and name is underscribed, that he had better hopes by my once moving the King, than he formerly had, by the solicitations and means of all the friends he had at court. And no longer ago than at Christmas last, I moved the King my master again in his behalf, and then had he solicited that which was intended for his good, and prosecuted the same with submission, it had in all likelihood gone better with him than he could have expected, nay, I think, as the case stood, than he then deserved. But a cross business came just

in the way at the very time, of which your lordships, or the most part of you, I am sure, are privy to, and had not I then interposed myself, the King being then so exasperated against him, he had fallen. But I let pass my desires, and the earnestness I used, lest my public aspersion should have been opened, and such as could not have been wiped away, but needs must have left a stain upon my coat [1]."

I have said that it is not my intention to detail this trial, because my limits will not permit. On a review of the proceedings, although I neither justify its severity, nor defend the measures, I am convinced that Laud was not actuated by any private resentment towards Williams, with whom he had just cause to be offended; and that, as Williams was in no respect Laud's patron, as has been often alleged, the charge of ingratitude brought against the Archbishop by his enemies is utterly false and gratuitous. Williams was sentenced by the whole court, and the first mover of the sentence was Lord Cottington, to pay a fine of 10,000*l.* to the King, to be imprisoned in the Tower during the King's pleasure, and to be suspended by the High Commission Court from all his offices, preferments, and functions; which was accordingly done on the 24th of July, and his goods were seized at his palace of Bugden, to the value of the fine. Another infor-

[1] Archbishop Laud's Speech, apud Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 438—445.

mation was laid against him in February 1638-9, for holding a correspondence with Lambert Osbaldistone, Master of Westminster school, whose letters were found in his own house at Bugden, written by that individual to him in 1633, in which Archbishop Laud was grossly libelled, and styled "the little urchin," [alluding to the Archbishop's diminutive stature,] "the little meddling Hocus Pocus." For this he was sentenced to pay 5000*l.* more, and 3000*l.* to the Archbishop; and Osbaldistone was fined 5000*l.* to the King, 5000*l.* also to the Archbishop, and for his seditious allusions in his correspondence, to be deprived of his preferments, imprisoned during the King's pleasure, to stand in the pillory, and his ears to be nailed to the posts. Osbaldistone consulted his safety by a timely flight, which occasioned the jest, that *he had gone beyond Canterbury*. Bishop Williams continued in the Tower till 1640, when he was liberated, and shortly afterwards was reconciled to the King [1].

In July, 1637, we find the Archbishop procuring a decree to be passed in the Star Chamber to regulate the printing of books,—that a certain number only should be published, and that none should be printed till they were licensed by himself, as Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, or their chaplains, or by the Chancellors and

[1] Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 416—449. vol. iii. p. 306. Diary, p. 54. Phillips' Life of Archbishop Williams, 12mo. p. 193—213. Hacket's Life of Williams, p. 115, 116, 117, &c. Lord Clarendon, vol. i. 317, &c. Heylin, p. 323—327.

Vice-Chancellors of the Universities. On the 22d of October, this year, he made a speech against the Papists, which gave great offence to the Queen. By the practices of Walter Montague, a younger son of the Earl of Manchester, and Sir Toby Matthews, son to the late Archbishop Matthews of York, (an undeserving son, says Heylin, of a worthy father,) the Countess of Newport had been seduced to the Popish Church. The conduct of those two incendiaries had been long notorious, and their insolence was increased by the patronage and countenance of the Queen. The Archbishop had hitherto refrained from interfering; but he determined, at length, to endure it no longer. Accordingly, in a speech delivered with his usual warmth, and addressed to the King at the Council table, he spoke on the increase of the Papists, their open and unsufferable misdemeanours, practising upon the people, and resorting to Denmark House in great numbers. The Queen was informed of the Archbishop's speech that very night, and made no secret of her displeasure. But it availed little: Montague and Matthews were dismissed from the Court; the Popish Party was thereby weakened, and the Queen, after some expostulations with the Archbishop on the subject, was compelled to conceal her resentment.

In some of these details I have anticipated a few events for the sake of connexion, and perhaps I have been unnecessarily prolix in the account of the Star-Chamber proceedings, with the exception of

the trial of Bishop Williams, on which I have for obvious reasons, refrained from making any comment. But I trust that I have laid the history of this important period before the reader fairly and impartially, and it has been my sole endeavour to vindicate the Archbishop from those aspersions and calumnies which have been constantly heaped upon him by the abettors of Puritanism. The affairs of Scotland now demand our consideration.

CHAPTER XVI.

1637.

Affairs of Scotland—The Scottish Church—Outline of its history from the Reformation—Imprudence of the Scottish Prelates—Proceedings of Laud—He corresponds with the Scottish Bishops—Injudicious publication of the Scottish Canons—The Liturgy—Fury of the Presbyterians—Their practices—The Earl of Traquair—His treachery—First reading of the Scottish Liturgy—Dreadful riot at Edinburgh—Practices of the Presbyterian leaders—Henderson, Dickson, &c.—Proceedings of the Privy Council—History of the disorders—Letters to Laud—Discussion on the Scottish Liturgy, &c.—Proved to be written by the Scottish Bishops—Observations—Proceedings of the Presbyterians—History of their crafty intrigues—Letters of the Magistrates of Edinburgh to Archbishop Laud—State of the kingdom—Riot at Glasgow—Conduct of the Presbyterian leaders—Daring riots of the Presbyterians at Edinburgh—Flight of the Scottish Privy Council—Royal Proclamations—Establishment of the Tables—Prelude to the Covenant—Its institution—Is sworn at Edinburgh—Blasphemy of the Covenanters—Remarkable anecdotes—Defeat of the Covenanters at Aberdeen—Observations.

EVERY sincere member of the Church of England, (I will not say every sincere Christian, lest I be charged with bigotry) must feel an interest in the annals of Scottish Episcopacy. A flourishing Church, which had to contend with enthusiasts for nearly a century, at the memorable Revolution

supplanted by Presbyterianism, its clergy *rabbled out* (as the Presbyterians expressed it) from their livings by fanatical mobs, and made the sport and impious mockery of Covenanters and factious zealots: while the great names which have adorned its communion are now, alas! forgotten, "unnoticed and unknown," by an ungrateful country; these are facts which evince the instability of human affairs, and the misfortunes which attend all national Revolutions, even when these are eventually productive of beneficial consequences, where there are a few upright, though it may be mistaken, men, who look upon loyalty to their legitimate sovereign as unworthy to be put in competition with their own private interests. Let me not be misunderstood in admiring the conduct and disinterestedness of the Scottish prelates in 1688.

It would require volumes to detail and discuss this interesting subject, which yet, even in this prolific age of literature, remains to be discussed; and, did it come within my present plan, I would shew, that the Episcopal Church of Scotland was from the very first the legitimate and national Church of that kingdom; that Presbytery is consequently a plant of a foreign soil; that *if* the Covenanters were *persecuted*, they were persecuted by the State, and not by the Church; that all along the Episcopal clergy were devoted loyalists; that they were, in general, men of piety and learning; and that the conduct of the prelates, when they were deprived of their dioceses, has entitled

those noble and ill-requited men, who endured innumerable privations, sufferings, and hardships from the Presbyterian victors, to the admiration of every genuine Episcopalian and lover of his country; in short, I would trace the secret history of rebellion, fanaticism, and covenanting treason, dignified as these have been, and still are, by the epithets of freedom, religion, and liberty; these would I trace in connexion with the English Puritans, and place in its true light the history of a Church which has been falsely asserted to have been as persecuting and intolerant as its Popish predecessor. But I must refrain at present, for the subject is too copious and important. That Church has now fallen—fallen, I mean, so far as its rights are concerned; though not fallen from its primitive order and government; and, I must say it, *to the disgrace of England,* its clergy are suffered to languish in neglect, while even the Presbyterian ministers in Ireland are aided by the State.

It was otherwise, however, in the days of Archbishop Laud. That illustrious prelate in his regard for religion, and in his desire to establish the Reformed Church secure from the attacks of Papists and malcontents, was not neglectful of the Scottish Church, and I have already discussed his transactions with the northern clergy. To him it appeared, that the Church should present the appearance of a well-compacted body, not subject to the contentions of zealots and the dissatisfactions of designing men. He was no stranger to the outrages of en-

thusiasm, and he knew too well that the powers which the Presbyterian assemblies of the 17th century arrogated to themselves were not exceeded by those of the Vatican.

After the departure of Charles from Scotland, the Bishops were commanded to correspond with the Archbishop of Canterbury upon the ecclesiastical affairs of that kingdom. We find an order from the King to Dr. Ballentine, Bishop of Dumblane, then Dean of the Chapel Royal at Holyrood Palace, respecting the use of the English Liturgy in that Chapel, both because such had been the command of James I., and because, as attached to the palace, the King had a right to have divine service performed as he pleased in his own household. The directions, bearing date the 8th of October, 1633, are seven in number, and a letter was also written at the same time to Archbishop Laud by the King, requiring him to hold correspondence with the said Bishop of Dumblane, that the said Bishop might from time to time receive his Majesty's directions for ordering of such things as concerned the service in that Chapel.

It has been already observed, that the rapacity of the Scottish nobles in seizing the revenues of the Church, was overlooked by the Scottish Reformers. This seizure was in the reign of Mary, before the Parliament of 1560, and finally before that of 1567, which ratified the destruction of the Popish Church. They had appropiated to themselves a considerable portion of the ecclesiastical

estates. It was in vain that even John Knox remonstrated with those selfish peers on this injustice, and even denounced against them the judgment of Heaven; he was met by sneers, mockery, and ridicule, and was compelled to receive the scanty pittances awarded to himself and his brethren by those task-masters [1]. In the ensuing reign, during the minority of James, the lands attached to the cathedrals and religious houses, and which had been annexed to the Crown by Act of Parliament [2], were all appropriated to noble families, by the connivance, if not the co-operation, of the ambitious Earl of Moray, and the other Regents, especially the avaricious Morton; and these families, thus possessed of the regalities and tythes, ruled the unfor-

[1] In Knox's History, p. 275, 276, there is a curious passage on this subject. "Every thing," says Knox, "that repugned to their corrupt imaginations, was termed in their mockage, devout imaginations. The cause we have before declared; some were licentious, some had greedily griped the possessions of the Church, and others thought that they would not lack their part of Christ's coat, yea, and that before he was crucified, as by the preachers they were oft rebuked. The chief great man that professed Christ Jesus, and refused to subscribe the Book of Discipline was the Lord Erskine. And no wonder, for besides that he had a very evil woman to his wife, if the poore, the schooles, and the ministerie of the Church had their owne, his kitchen would lack two parts, and more of that which he now unjustly possesseth. There were more within the realm, more unmercifull to the poore ministers, than were which had greatest rents of the Churches. But in that we have perceived the old proverb to be true. Nothing can suffice a wretch, and again, the belly hath no ears."

[2] James VI. Parl. ii.

tunate serfs of the soil with no lenient hand. Some remarks, however, have already been made on this subject; suffice it for the present to observe, that the Act of Charles in restoring to the Church the lands of which it had been so unjustly deprived by those rapacious and insolent nobles, excited their hatred towards the Clergy, which made them resolve to embroil the Court on the very first opportunity.

The promotions of the Scottish prelates, moreover, to some of the most influential places in the kingdom, farther increased their discontentment. They, indeed, cordially despised the Presbyterian ministers, whose fanaticism and intolerance they held in supreme contempt, but as those individuals, in their anxiety for power and influence, laid no claim to the ecclesiastical revenues with which those haughty nobles were enriching themselves, and besides, as those nobles were in general men of no religion, they preferred them infinitely to the Bishops, who had become formidable opponents to their ambition. They also observed, with regret, that it was the intention of the King to raise the Scottish Church to splendor and eminence: it was enough for them that their rapacity had been disappointed.

I have already admitted, that the promotion of some of the Bishops was perhaps hasty and injudicious; it must also be confessed, that some of the subsequent measures were also rash and ill-chosen. This was particularly the case in the matter of the Book of Canons, necessary in themselves, but which

ought not to have preceded the Liturgy. The Scottish prelates had evinced considerable repugnance to adopt the English Book of Common Prayer; and accordingly, Spottiswoode, the Archbishop of St. Andrew's; Dr. Patrick Lyndsey, Archbishop of Glasgow; Dr. James Wedderburne, Bishop of Dumblane, who had been removed from an English benefice to this bishopric; Dr. John Guthrie, Bishop of Moray; Dr. John Maxwell, Bishop of Ross; and Dr. Walter Whiteford, Bishop of Brechin, were the prelates who framed the Scottish Liturgy [1], and the canons, which they were enjoined to transmit for revisal to Laud, who was assisted in that duty by the Bishop of London, and Wren, Bishop of Norwich, "a man," says the noble historian, "of a severe, sour nature, but very learned, and particularly versed in the old Liturgies of the Greek and Latin Churches [2]."

There was unquestionably a want of unity among the Scottish prelates, who were all of them learned men, which very much tended to mislead the Archbishop in his Scottish directions. So anxious was he that nothing should be done in opposition to the laws and statutes of the kingdom, that he had always declared to the Scottish Bishops, "that it was their part to be certain that they should propose nothing to the King in the business of the Church, contrary to the laws of the land, which he could

[1] Heylin, p. 222. Hist. of Troubles and Trials, p. 168, 169.

[2] Lord Clarendon, vol. i. p. 153.

not be thought to understand: and that they should never put any thing in execution without the consent of the Privy Council." But, from a fatal inadvertency, and from a false and most erroneous opinion entertained by the prelates who had been promoted to the Scottish Sees during Laud's public life, that they would please the English Primate by a ready compliance, and by fallacious representations that there would be no opposition, in which they totally misunderstood his nature, they neglected this wise admonition, and even acted contrary to the advice of their more experienced brethren. Accordingly, in the year 1635, the Book of Canons was finished, after a complete revisal by the Archbishop, and the Bishops of London and Norwich, and on the 23d of May, that year, a royal proclamation was issued, commanding them to be duly observed within the kingdom of Scotland[1].

Those Canons were judicious and highly necessary, but the great error lay in causing them to be published before the Liturgy. It is to be recollected, however, (although the Presbyterians choose to forget the fact,) that the undertaking was warranted by the Act of Assembly held at Aberdeen, in 1616, which also ratified the publishing of a Liturgy, and which had been delayed to the present time by the intervention of many important

[1] Lord Clarendon, vol. i. book ii. p. 154, 155. Heylin, p. 280, 281. Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 763, &c. Wodrow's MSS. vol. iii. Life of Spottiswoode, p. 134. 141, 142. Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 206.

affairs. But, in the present state of the kingdom, those humours ought to have been gratified, and the Scottish prelates, as Lord Clarendon wisely observes, ought not to have "inverted the proper method, and first presented a body of canons to precede the Liturgy, which was not yet ready, choosing to finish the shorter work first." It was, moreover, set forth in one of the Canons, that those persons should be censured and excommunicated, who should affirm that the worship contained in the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments contained any thing repugnant to the Scriptures, or was corrupt, superstitious, or unlawful in the service and worship of God. Another canon declared, that "every presbyter shall, either by himself or by another person, lawfully called, read, or cause divine service to be done, according to the form of the Book of Common Prayer, before all sermons, and that he should officiate by the said Book of Common Prayer before all sermons, and that he should officiate by the said Book of Common Prayer in all the offices, parts, and rubrics of it." Now, here was the misfortune: these orders were issued when no person in Scotland had *seen* the Liturgy, except the Bishops who had compiled it; and consequently they were peculiarly apt to excite a speculation among the enthusiasts for Genevan parity.

It will thus appear, however, that these compilations were altogether Scottish, and that great injustice was done to Archbishop Laud in charging

them upon him. I have said the canons were judicious and necessary, had they only been preceded by the Liturgy; and I prove the assertion by the reasons assigned by the King in his Royal Declaration. "First, that he (his Majesty) held it exceedingly imperative, that there should be some book extant to contain the rules of the ecclesiastical government; so that the clergy as well as the laity might have one certain rule to regulate the power of the one, and obedience and practice of the other. Second, that the Acts of General Assemblies were *written only*, and not printed, and therefore could not come to the knowledge of many; so large and voluminous, that it was not easy to transcribe them, insomuch that few of the Presbyters themselves could tell which of them were authenticated, which not; so unsafely and uncertainly kept, that they knew not where to address themselves for consulting them. Thirdly, that by reducing those numerous Acts (and those not known unto themselves,) to such a paucity of canons, published and exposed to the public view, no man could be ensnared by ignorance, or have just reason to complain of their multiplicity. Finally, that not one in all that kingdom did either live under the obedience of the Acts of those General Assemblies, or did know what they were, or where to find them." In short, the whole would have been right, had not the fatal inadvertency of their preposterous promulgation been committed, because by this means the Presbyterian preachers got time to examine, to find out defects,

and to persuade weak men that they were intended for the introduction of Popery. "It was strange," observes the noble historian, "that canons should be published before the Liturgy was prepared, which was not ready in a year after, or thereabouts, when three or four of the canons were principally for the observation of, and punctual compliance with, the Liturgy, which all the clergy were to be sworn to submit to, and to pay all obedience to what was enjoined by it, before they knew what it contained; whereas, if the Liturgy had been first published, with all the circumstances, it is possible that it might have found a better reception, and the canons have been less examined."

Those canons contained little more than what had been agreed to by the Perth Assembly, when the Five Articles were sanctioned; and, of course, they were peculiarly obnoxious to the Presbyterian faction. But what particularly offended the leading enthusiasts, was the power which the King assumed over the ecclesiastical assemblies, prohibiting them to be called except by royal authority. They had maintained with an inquisitorial intolerance, the Presbyterian dogma, now indeed disclaimed by the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, that the King had no power in ecclesiastical matters; that there was a distinction between temporal and spiritual jurisdiction, the one pertaining to the King, the other to the Church; in other words, that they had a right to do as they pleased, to speak, act, convene, and dissolve Assemblies, when they thought

proper; that their proceedings were not even to be reviewed by Parliaments; that, in short, as ministers, they were independent of all civil authority. This was to the point; here was a body of religious zealots legislating as they thought proper, who set law at defiance, who, moreover, in the plenitude of those powers which they so insolently arrogated to themselves, were as officious enthusiasts in politics as they were in religion, and who indulged in the most extravagant notions respecting spiritual affairs. But it was a death-blow to their intrigues, their practices, and their love of declamation, when they were told that they were not to meet without the King's authority. It was indeed a most dangerous dogma, as their own former conduct had sufficiently proved, destructive evidently of all civil order in an age of hypocrisy and enthusiasm, when men consulted their passions and prejudices more than their reason; it was only paralleled by the pretensions of the Church of Rome, nay, in some cases it exceeded these; for in arrogating pretensions, heaven-derived powers, perfection, infallibility, the Presbyterianism of Scotland yielded not to the Church of Rome. And as they had in times past disclaimed the King's authority either in calling their Assemblies, or in the acts and proceedings thereof, pretending that they had sufficient power in themselves, because they conceived themselves, in their phraseology, to be acting "for the Lord Jesus Christ," it was not to be supposed that they would yield obedience to this injunction, or, in

fact, to any of the canons, about which they had never been consulted, and on which they had no opportunity to display their rhetoric. "But," says Heylin, "as they had broken the rules of the Primitive Church, in acting as sovereigns themselves, without the King's approbation or consent in former times, so were they now upon the point of having those old rules of theirs broken by the King, in making canons, and putting laws and constructions upon them for their future conduct, to which they had never consented. And therefore, though his Majesty had taken so much care, as himself observed, for facilitating their obedience by furthering their knowledge in those points which before they knew not, yet they did generally behold it, and exclaimed against it, as one of the most grievous burdens which had hitherto been laid upon them."

Yet, notwithstanding those clamours, Scotland was apparently tranquil; no public outrage or burst of indignation from the discontented zealots attended the proclamation of the canons. But they had dark and seditious designs in progress; this silence was an effort of their crafty prudence. The enthusiastic leaders contemplated in private the success of those schemes they had revolved in their minds; their future excesses of riot and rebellion arose before them in joyful anticipation; were they to ruin their schemes, by exciting the popular fanaticism against the canons, when the Liturgy was yet to appear? To tolerate, or to feign a compliance with, those injunctions, was the most certain method for causing

a tremendous burst of popular fury and madness. Such were the practices of those "godly saints;" they infused jealousies into the minds of the people, by all those artifices which they knew so well how to employ. "Yet they would not suffer, (which shewed wonderful power and wonderful dexterity) any disorder to break out upon this occasion, but all was quiet, except spreading of libels against the Bishops, and propagating that spirit as much as they could by their correspondence in England, where they found too many every day transported by the same infusions, in expectation that these seeds of jealousy from the canons would grow apace, and produce such a reception for the Liturgy as they wished[1]."

For one grand object, then, they reserved all their strength. In the month of July, (the 23d), the Liturgy, after having been revised by Archbishop Laud, Bishops Juxon and Wren, was commanded by royal proclamation to be read in all the churches of the kingdom. On the preceding Sunday, it was announced in all the churches of Edinburgh, but no indications of tumult or dissatisfaction appeared. The inhabitants of that city, indeed, were no strangers to it, as set forth in the English Book of Common Prayer. For twenty years, that admirable Liturgy had been read in the chapel royal of Holyrood, then used as the parish church of the Canongate, (within which borough

[1] Lord Clarendon, vol. i. book ii. p. 158. Bishop Guthrie's Memoirs, p. 16.

and parish the Palace is situated,) and frequented by people of all ranks. In the cathedral, too, it had been used; at Aberdeen, that venerable Episcopal city, and famed even yet for its adherence to primitive order; at St. Andrew's, the seat of the primacy, and in St. Mary's, or the Divinity College of that University, founded by Archbishop James Beaton. Moreover, when the King had been in Scotland, it was used in all the churches which he attended. Yet so deep was the design, and so well contrived was the intended profane riot, that on the very Sunday of its announcement the Liturgy was highly extolled by many of those very zealots who were afterwards the ringleaders in the Covenant.

The previous Easter had been the time appointed for the first reading of the Liturgy, but on the representation of the Earl of Traquair, the Scottish Lord High Treasurer, who corresponded with the Archbishop of Canterbury, it was delayed till July, under the pretence that in the interval the people might become more disposed to its reception. This was a fatal mistake; for by this delay, which seems to have been a device of Traquair, who was by no means well affected towards the Church, the factious had time to revolve their designs. Had the Liturgy, since unfortunately it did not precede the Book of Canons, immediately followed,—had orders been issued thereupon that every clergyman should conform,—and had the bishops, in short, exerted themselves diligently to silence the schismatical and

refractory, there can be little doubt that every attempt at disturbance would have been defeated, and the fanatical Covenant might, perhaps, never have had an existence. Decision is the only course with sectaries, among whom there is little difference between the leniency which tolerates and the resolution which expels: for they, being actuated by a thorough malevolence and perversity, are not to be won by measures which counteract or humour their inclinations. It was by this very delay that the discontented party were enabled to gather strength, and to mature their plans: a clamour was raised against the Scottish Bishops, that "religion was undermined by a conspiracy between them and the English Archbishop, and that they, being stimulated by him, were about to introduce the Mass." It was industriously circulated by the Presbyterians, that the forthcoming Liturgy was a translation of the Missal, consequently, all who sanctioned it were, in their language, "idolators, and abettors of superstition:" in their conventicles, and in private conversation, they declaimed against it; they wrought upon the prejudices of the people; and, had an angel from heaven appeared with the Liturgy, so inveterate was their hatred, and so blind and perverted their understandings, that it may reasonably be supposed he would have met with the same reception from those zealots as did the members of the Episcopal Church of Scotland.

Lord Clarendon is inclined to vindicate Traquair, but it is evident from that nobleman's con-

duct, from the opposition he manifested in secret towards the bishops, and from the private encouragement he gave to the Presbyterians, that he was secretly aiming at the overthrow of the Church. Bishop Guthrie and others represent him as treacherous and ungrateful: he owed his advancement to Laud, who relied upon the honesty of his communications: it was on his account that the advice of the venerable Spottiswoode was neglected, who, perceiving the danger that had arisen from the Canons first appearing, now wished for a farther delay. Traquair, however, wrote at one time that the work should proceed, and then, before Easter, he wrote for a delay: he asserted to the Archbishop of Canterbury, "that there was no danger to be apprehended, only the old bishops were timorous men, and feared where there was no cause of fear: in proof of which, if his Grace would move the King to lay his commands upon him, upon his life he would carry through the business, *without any disturbance.*" And yet, while writing thus, Traquair was practising against the younger bishops, was conscious that there would be opposition, and thus misled Laud by fallacious representations, to pursue a course which otherwise he would have avoided. It was by Traquair's influence, in short, that the order of 23d July was procured; nor did he take any steps to inform the government of the state of the public mind, even when he knew that Edinburgh, on the previous week, was filled with seditious zealots, who industriously circulated libellous

papers and inflammatory discourses, preparing the people for the meditated tumult, but protested, "*upon his life,* that he would carry through the business *without any disturbance.*"

By this delay, the Presbyterian leaders found leisure to facilitate their designs. Alexander Henderson, minister of Leuchars, in the county of Fife, and one Dickson, from the western county of Ayrshire, two chiefs of the opposing faction, repaired to Edinburgh in the month of April, before the introduction of the Liturgy, and held a convention of their friends. This was the famous Henderson who afterwards was defeated in the well known dispute he held with the King on the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy,—a man of some learning, but of low cunning and vast ambition, whose fanaticism was tempered by a peculiar regard for his own interest. He was a renegade from Episcopacy, and having originally been a Professor in the University of St. Andrew's, he applied himself to secure the favour of Archbishop Gladstanes, who, deceived by his flattery, presented him to the benefice of Leuchars. Disappointed, however, in his ambition, he went over to the Presbyterian party, and soon became their leader and head. On this occasion, Henderson and Dickson, being delegated by the factious in their several counties, communicated with Lord Balmerino, the nobleman who had in a former year experienced the King's mercy, for which he made this ungrateful return; Sir Thomas Hope, the King's Advocate, and others. Having tutored

some fanatical old women (for they scrupled at no expedients) to commence an uproar in the church when the service began, assuring them that the business would be speedily taken out of their hands by men stationed for the purpose, they departed to their respective places of abode, calmly waiting the general issue of their practices.

On Sunday, the 23d of July, the Scottish Liturgy was first read in St. Giles' church, Edinburgh, agreeable to the royal proclamation. In the previous week, Henderson and others proceeded to Edinburgh to witness the defeat of the Church, and the success of their fanatical sedition. The Dean of Edinburgh prepared to officiate in St. Giles', and the Bishop of Argyle in the church of the Greyfriars, a parish in the southern quarter of the city. To increase the solemnity of the service, or rather, to shew that it was sanctioned by the men of influence in the nation, many of the members of the Privy Council, the two Archbishops, some of the Bishops, the members of the College of Justice called the Lords of Session, and the magistrates of the city, with a vast concourse of people, attended at St. Giles' church. The Presbyterians, in the mean time, had not been idle: they had tutored the old women to commence the uproar; and men, disguised in women's apparel, mingled among the auditors in the church. It was then the custom for the poorer classes to carry with them small seats, or stools, on which they sat during the service. The utmost silence prevailed till the Dean of Edinburgh

appeared in the reading-desk with his surplice, and began the service, when immediately an old woman, named Janet Geddes, (for the dignity of history must descend to record her name as connected with this adventure), began the tumult, and uttered against him the most profane imprecations [1]. The Dean, however, courageously proceeded, till the noise became absolutely deafening. The old women, stimulated by the future Covenanters in disguise, began their horrid croaking: clapping of hands, hisses, imprecations, roarings, and curses, completed the profane riot, and made every sentence totally inaudible. An attack was made by the sybils and their abettors on the Dean in the reading-desk, and with difficulty he escaped being torn to pieces, by disengaging himself from his surplice, and leaving this trophy of victory in their hands. The Bishop of Edinburgh, Dr. David Lindsey, who was that day to preach, then ascended the pulpit, hoping to appease the tumult, by entreating the people to recollect the sacred place in which they were assembled, and the duty they owed to God and their sovereign. But the appearance of the prelate only increased the ferment:—sticks, stones, and other missiles, were discharged at the pulpit, a stool was actually aimed at him, which, had

[1] "Out, out, thou false thief, dost thou say mass at my lugg." Defoe's Memoirs of the Church of Scotland, p. 179. Arnot's History of Edinburgh, p. 108. Bishop Keith's Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops, p. 39.

it not been averted by a friendly hand, would have killed him upon the spot. Spottiswoode, the Archbishop, now interfered: he called from the gallery on the magistrates to exercise their authority, and with great difficulty the fanatical rabble were thrust out, and the doors made secure. The service was then resumed by the Dean, but the rioters, though they had been expelled from the Church, renewed their activity. The exclamations, "A Pope! a Pope! Antichrist! pull him down, stone him!" were uttered with the utmost vehemence; they attacked the doors, broke the windows, and seemed resolved to commit the most dreadful excesses. Amidst this noise and tumult the service was concluded. When the prelates left the Church, they were insulted in the grossest manner: the Bishop of Edinburgh was dragged from the staircase of his own house, and would have fallen a sacrifice to their fury had he not been rescued by some attendants of the Earl of Wemyss.

Nor was the Liturgy much better received in the other churches of the city. In one adjoining to St. Giles', there was indeed less uproar, but sufficient indications of disapprobation. In the Greyfriars' church, it was interrupted by sobs, groans, hisses, and loud lamentations, and was at length given up, after the general confession and absolution had been read. The minister of Trinity College church, founded by Mary of Gueldres, although he had engaged to perform it, delayed to do so till he had learned its reception in the other

churches, and at length preferred the extemporaneous form, for his own safety.

Before the afternoon service, a meeting of the Council was held at the residence of Archbishop Spottiswoode. The provost and magistrates of the city attended, and such precautions were taken as prevented any disturbance in the afternoon. But after evening prayer, the tumult was greater in the streets than in the morning. The Bishop of Edinburgh, suspected to be the most active promoter of the affair, was again attacked, and though he was in the Earl of Roxburgh's coach, who was exceedingly popular, and who was suspected to favour the riot, he escaped with great difficulty. The coach was pelted with stones, and though driven at full speed, it was saved from being torn to pieces only by Roxburgh's servants, who kept off the rioters with drawn swords. In other parts of Scotland, the Liturgy met with a similar reception, except at St. Andrew's, and in the cathedrals of Brechin, Ross, and Dunblane [1].

On the following day, a meeting of the Privy Council was held, which was attended by the ma-

[1] Burnet's Memorials, p. 31. History of the Duke of Hamilton, p. 31. Arnot's History of Edinburgh, 4to. p. 107—109. Lord Clarendon, vol. i. p. 160—164. Peck's Desiderata Curiosa, vol. ii. p. 50. King's Declaration, p. 23—25. Rushworth's Collections, vol ii. p. 387—389. Crawford's Officers of State, folio, p. 181, 182. Heylin, p. 327, 328. Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 777. Whitelock's Memorials, p. 27. Bishop Guthrie's Memoirs, p. 19, 20. Wodrow MSS. p. 145, 146. Kirkton's History of the Church of Scotland, 4to.

gistrates. They expressed their indignation at the tumult, and appeared anxious to bring the rioters to punishment, but it is somewhat strange that none of them were apprehended, which could have been easily done on Sunday, when they were in the excess of their insolence. There was here a remarkable neglect of duty, for had a few of the ringleaders been taken into custody, and punished according to their deserts, it would not unlikely have had an important effect on the minds of the people. It might have saved the blood which was afterwards shed; it might have taught the enthusiasts, who cunningly excited this commotion, a salutary lesson; and had cognizance been taken of such men as Henderson, Dick, and Cant, the oracles of sedition might have been silenced in due time. Secret despatches were in the mean while sent to the King, and his instructions implored as to the future proceedings.

It is somewhat singular, that the two great tumults of the Scottish Church, which were pregnant with the most momentous consequences, should have been begun by mean and unworthy agents. The Presbyterians, indeed, termed it the "finger of the Lord," as "opening the mouths of the simple to testify against corruptions;" but it is remarkable, that both tumults were stimulated by fanaticism, and carried on by the mob. The first happened at Perth, under the auspices of John Knox, in 1560, "who arrived in that city," says Bishop Keith, "in the very nick of time," and edified a

vast multitude by one of his furious tirades against the Romish Church, by which he stimulated them to the unhallowed act of destroying the monasteries and religious edifices. After his harangue, a priest prepared to celebrate mass, and, uncovering the tabernacle, on the altar, displayed the utensils for the service. A lad, doubtless previously instigated by some of the zealots, standing near the priest, exclaimed, that such open contempt of God's word was intolerable, for which he was deservedly chastised by the priest. In a state of mind not willing to submit to this conceived affront, he aimed a stone at the altar, which was the signal for universal havoc: and the unfortunate priest escaped with difficulty from their unhallowed hands.—In like manner, under the auspices of Henderson, a renegade from Episcopacy, and others, some infuriated old women, led on by Janet Geddes, first stimulated to war and national rebellion. Unworthy instruments, truly, for the commencement of what the Presbyterians are pleased to term "the second Reformation," and an admirable prognostication of that cause in which they were to be engaged. The extravagances of those zealots excited the ridicule of many. "Salute the sisters," says the author of a bitter satire against the Presbyterians, "with a holy kiss: to whom you do but your duty when you acknowledge your cause much indebted unto them, and that in those your Esthers and Judiths your work had but a small beginning: and when men durst not resent the beginnings, it is usually observed by

one of you, that *God moved the spirit of those holy women to scourge the buyers and sellers out of God's house, and not to suffer the same to be polluted with that foul Book of Common Prayer.* Those holy matrons, who waste themselves with fasting, have deserved so well at your hands, that you should exhort them as Paul did Timothy, 'to take a little wine to strengthen them,' and to encourage them to proceed zealously in your cause, for they are the weaker vessels, and wine will strengthen them therein[1]." Lamentable, however, as was this tumult, and unworthy of any people, whatever may have been their opinions, except fanatics, and though popular prejudice is still existing, apart indeed from outward acts of violence, as it was on this unhappy occasion, few, it is conceived, will vindicate the dastardly practices of Henderson and his associates, who, to gain their purposes, scrupled not to violate the sanctity of a Christian church, to profane the day set apart for public worship, and to excite the prejudices and the worst passions of an ignorant rabble on that holy day. The exploits of those sybils and their abettors have been recorded with Presbyterian exultation; they have been regarded as decisive in the refutation of liturgical worship, but the candid and liberal mind will agree with the following remark, that "the

[1] The Epistle Congratulorie of Lysimachus Nicanor, of the Societie of Jesus, to the Covenanters in Scotland, wherein is paralleled our sweet harmony, and corresponding in divers material points of doctrine and practice, 1640, p. 73.

question of a liturgy for the public worship of God is not decided by the consequences of a violent and vulgar riot excited by Janet Geddes[1]."

[1] Scottish Episcopal Magazine, vol. iii. p. 488, in the Life of Laud. This *holy* matron is said to have done penance on the stool of repentance, the Sunday previous to this exploit, for her licentious life, but as she was, according to the Covenanters, one of the *elect*, the greater the sinner, the greater the *saint*. In the MS. History of the Church of Scotland, by John Row, Minister at Carnock, Fifeshire, and preserved in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, there is the following account of the tumult, long known in Scotland by the epithets of "Stoney Sunday," and "the casting of stools." "So soon as the Bishop began to open the service-book, and to read therein, and the people perceiving the Dean opening his book also, all the common people, and especiallie the women, rose up with such a loud clamour, and uproare, so that nothing could be heard: some cryed, Woe! woe! some cryed, Sorrow! sorrow! for this dolefull day! that they are bringing in Poperie among us! others did cast their stooles against the Deanes face, others ran out of the kirk with a pitifull lamentation, so that the reading upon the service-book was then interrupted. The Archbishop of St. Andrew's, now also Chancellor, and the rest of the Bishops who were in the kirk, cryed for peace and quietness, but were not heard, therefore the Bishop left him reading, and taught a sermon, but a very short one. After sermon, when the Bishop came out of the pulpit, and went out of the Kirk, he found the street full of people, who ran about him, crying that he was bringing in a new religion among them, and bringing in Poperie upon them. The Bishop, put in greate fear, ran up the nearest staire to have gotten into my Lord Weemes' ludging, crying to the people that he had no wyte [blame] of the matter, yet the people had rather been in hands with the Deane, who helped himself in the kirk, till the great tumult was appeased." It may be remarked, that the writers of that period have described it in the most ignorant and contradictory manner.

The tidings of this outrageous tumult gave great offence to the court, and it appears that Laud was fully convinced that it might have been checked, had the civil authorities vigorously interfered, and made examples of some of the rabble. In a letter to the Earl of Traquair, dated August 7, he comments on the riot with his usual ability, and in such a manner as Traquair could not fail to apply to himself, although he was absent on the occasion. Nor was the Archbishop less severe on the clergy, whom he charged with great imprudence in their management of the affairs of the Church[1]. In this, indeed, Traquair cordially acquiesced with the Archbishop, as appears from a letter of the former to the Marquis of Hamilton, in which he lays the whole blame of the miscarriage on the Bishops, though he evidently writes from private resentment: "for certainly," says he, "some of the leading men amongst them are so violent and forward, and many times without sound and pure judgments, that their want of right understanding how to compass business of this nature and weight, doth often breed us many difficulties, and their rash and foolish expressions, and sometimes attempts, both in public and private, have bred such a fear and jealousy in the hearts of many, that I am confident, if his Majesty were rightly informed thereof, he would blame them,

[1] The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Earl of Traquair, apud Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 329. 390.

and justly think, that from these and the like proceedings, arise the grounds of many mistakes among us[1]." Had Traquair, however, reflected for a moment on the faction opposed to the Church, and the dark practices employed by its leaders to inflame the passions of the vulgar, he would not have written in a strain which so well applied to himself. But he owed the Clergy a private grudge, because Maxwell, Bishop of Ross, had competed with him for the office of Lord High Treasurer, and because "they complained that the former ages had taken from them many of their rents, and had robbed them of their power and jurisdiction."

The magistrates of Edinburgh, in the mean time, wrote most submissively to Archbishop Laud, protesting their own innocence, and declaring that in all things they had been obedient to their sovereign, as the Earl of Traquair, the Bishops of Galloway and Dunblane, could bear witness[2]. The Archbishop was gratified by this letter; and, in another letter to the Earl of Traquair, dated September 11, he says that he had laid their "very full and discreet" letter before his Majesty, and "wrote the city an answer by the return, and given them his Majesty's thanks, which indeed he commanded me

[1] The Earl of Traquair to the Marquis of Hamilton, apud Rushworth, p. 391. and Burnet's Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, p. 31, 32.

[2] The Magistrates of Edinburgh to Archbishop Laud, 19th August, 1637. Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 393, 394.

to do very heartily, and, in truth, they deserve it, especially as times stand[1]." In a letter to the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, dated September 4, we find Archbishop Laud retracting his remarks on the clergy, which he had made in his letter to Traquair of August 7, and which probably the Scottish Primate had disclaimed as proceeding on wrong information. "Touching the tumult," says Laud, "I can say no more than I have already said, and for the imputing of any fault to your Grace, and the rest of your brethren, as if the thing were done precipitately, I think few men will believe that; but that which is thought here is, that though you took advice among yourselves, yet the whole body of the Council was not acquainted with your deliberations till it was too late, and that, after the thing was done, you consulted together, and sent up to the King without calling a council, or uniting the lay lords with you; whereas all was little enough in a business of this nature, and so much opposed by some factious men gathered, it seems, purposely at Edinburgh, to disturb this business[2]."

Without, however, following the correspondence of Archbishop Laud with the Scottish prelates and nobles, to whom the government of the state had been committed, great was the joy of the Puritan faction in England, when the leaders had learned the nature

[1] Archbishop Laud to the Earl of Traquair, Sept. 11, 1637.

[2] Archbishop Laud to the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, September 4, 1637.

of this tumult[1]. Notwithstanding Laud's moderation during the whole business, all the odium fell upon him, and it was afterwards alleged against him at his trial as a most heinous crime. I have in another place remarked, and proved, that the composition of the Liturgy was the work of the Scottish prelates, and this is admitted by the Presbyterian writers themselves[2]. I do not intend here to dispute, whether it was expedient to prepare a Liturgy for the Scottish Church or not: were I to state my own private opinion, I would assert, that its rejection was the utmost height of fanaticism, and the mode of its rejection the most daring rebellion. Unhappily the work miscarried; the love of novelty prevailed over primitive truth, and the indecent coarseness of Presbyterianism was more consonant to the designs of enthusiasts, than a mode of worship sanctioned by the Church universal, which restrained them from indulging in those personal invectives to which they were so much addicted. All that I maintain is, that the composition was Scottish,—that Laud, with Bishops Juxon and Wren, *only revised it*,—and that the fanatical Covenanters asserted an abominable falsehood, when they alleged, that the primate was the author and urger of some particular things which made great disturbance among them,—"and that" the "prelate of Canterbury" was the "prime cause on earth," of

[1] Archbishop Laud to Traquair, ut sup.

[2] Dr. Cook's History of the Church of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 356, 366.

" many dangerous errors in doctrine," and " innovations in religion."

It is impossible to give an abstract of the Scottish Liturgy in these pages, and the subject is too important to be passed over in a cursory manner. Archbishop Laud was positively charged with being instrumental to the introduction of Popery, as being the *compiler*, according to them, of a Liturgy, which contained " dangerous errors in doctrine." This allegation was aggravated by additional falsehoods, and with all the colourings which Covenanting fury could devise, in the " Charge of the Scottish Commissioners against Canterburie," printed in 1641, and inserted in the Archbishop's History of his own Troubles and Trials, where it is answered in every paragraph by himself, in his own masterly manner [1]. Kirkton, one of the enthusiasts of the Covenant, has indeed asserted, that " the King, to beget Scotland into the likeness of England, *sent down a Liturgy*, which was a great deal nearer the Roman Missal than the English Service-Book was. *I have seen*," says he, " the principal book, corrected with Bishop Laud's own hand, wherein, in every place which he corrected, he brings the word as near the Missal as English can be to Latin [2]." But who does not see

[1] History of Troubles and Trials, p. 87—143. Rushworth, vol. iii. p. 1370. The charge was published by the Scots themselves, in 1640. 4to. and it is in Prynne's Breviat, p. 31. Heylin, p. 466.

[2] Kirkton's History of the Church of Scotland, edited from the original MSS. by C. Kirkpatrick Sharpe, Esq. 4to. p. 30.

the contradictions of this prejudiced and intemperate jargon? If the King *sent down* the Liturgy to Scotland, it was first *sent up* to England; and as to the assertion that it was corrected with Bishop Laud's own hand, which Kirkton alleges to have seen, and the words brought "as near the Missal as English can be to Latin," the book itself, which is still extant, is a refutation. And what if it were? Would the Presbyterian zealot place the Missal on the same level with the Koran of Mahomet? Will he pretend to say, that the essential truths of Christianity are not to be found in the Missal, though accompanied with abundance of error? Is there not a single passage in the Missal which the most devoted enemy to Rome might employ without straining his conscience? Is scriptural truth to be rejected because it is mingled with, and accompanied by, Popish errors? Or will it be maintained, that Papists believe no truths of Christianity at all? and because there might be some approximations to the Missal in phraseology, which, nevertheless, is denied, do these prove the truth of what the Scots advanced, that when the Archbishop corrected the Liturgy, he had the Missal lying before him? Let me not be misunderstood; I repeat it again, that Popery is bad—morally, politically, and spiritually bad; but if Protestants choose to reject all that Papists believe, they must inevitably reject Christianity. I will not press the argument *ad verecundiam,* but in the zeal of the Covenanters to affirm that the Church of Rome was an entire mass of corruption, that

there was no truth to be found within its pale at all, would they have been gratified at being told that they themselves had no religion? Yet such is the conclusion, and, moreover, yielding this, what *their* religion *was,* requires little delineation.

But even if Archbishop Laud had composed this book, or had attempted, as was falsely asserted, to impose a religion of his own on the Church of Scotland, it would not have made him liable to the abominable charge of Popery, which Puritans, Independents, Gospellers, Anabaptists, Familists, and Covenanters, have advanced against him; and, therefore, I will maintain before any competent authority, that there is less of Popery in the Scottish Liturgy of King Charles I. than there is in any one of the offices of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England used at this moment in England, in the Scottish Episcopal Church, and every where in the British Dominions. The Scottish Communion Office is alone used, instead of the English, in some of the Episcopal congregations north of the Tay, though it is not the same as that of King Charles' Liturgy; and I maintain, and I have the authority of Bishop Horsley and others for the fact, that it is an admirable and truly apostolic compendium; according to that distinguished prelate, indeed, it is superior to the English Office, for he declares, that were it in his power, he would give the Scottish Communion Office the preference to the English. Collier, in his Ecclesiastical History, has enumerated all the differences between

the Scottish Liturgy and the English Book of Common Prayer, and he has also given us an account of the manner in which the Liturgy was framed [1]. The same will be found in the King's "Large Declaration [2]:" but the perusal of Hamon L'Estrange's "Alliance of Divine Offices," will at once shew wherein the Scottish Liturgy agreed, and wherein it differed, even in the *least* instance, from the Liturgy of the Church of England; and to this work I refer the reader, who wishes to judge with impartiality, and whose mind is not perverted by religious enthusiasm [3]. Let us note, in short, who made the charge against Laud that he was introducing Popery; men, as the noble historian remarks, whose "*religion* consisted in an entire detestation of Popery, in believing the Pope to be Antichrist, and *hating perfectly* the *persons* of Papists;"—Covenanters, Gospellers, Puritans, and a score of visionary and phrensied sectaries, who were as little able to judge, either from their natural talents or their learning, of the real and essential difference between Popery and Protestantism, as they were incapable of restraining their evil passions, and reasoning with calmness and moderation; men, in the language of Bishop Burnet, "who were all of a sort. They

[1] Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 767—769, compared with Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 208, 209.

[2] King Charles' Large Declaration, p. 17—19.

[3] L'Estrange's Alliance of Divine Offices, folio, 1659, particularly pp. 65, 66. 68. 70. 85, 86. 89. 92, 93. 107. 109, 110. 162. 164—169. 195. 201—209. 303.

affected great sublimity in devotion; they poured themselves out in their prayers in a loud voice, and often with many tears; they had an ordinary proportion of learning among them, something of Hebrew, and very little Greek; books of controversy with Papists, but, above all, with Arminians, was the height of their study. A way of preaching by doctrine, reason, and use, was what they set upon; and some of them affected a strain of stating cases of conscience, not with relation to moral actions, but to some reflections on their condition and temper, that was occasioned chiefly by their conceit of praying by the Spirit, which every one could not attain to, or keep up in the same heat at all times."

After all, while on this subject, since the rebellion of the Covenanters, with all their subsequent treason, was occasioned, according to them, by imposing upon them a form of worship, it may well be asked, in what religious service there is no form?—even a form of prayer, whether it be conducted in the philosophical simplicity of Presbyterianism, the solemn and primitive custom of the Church of England, or in the pompous ritual of the Church of Rome. An extemporaneous prayer (as has been remarked) of necessity must be a form; the minister has either composed it, or he has acquired the habit of employing a certain phraseology; the psalms and hymns which Presbyterians and other sectarians sing in public worship, are forms of prayer, especially if they employ the Psalms of David; but to be consistent, instead of having always the *same* psalms,

as they object to the *same* prayers in the Church of England, they should have new psalms for every act of worship. The apostolical benediction is a form, and yet they also employ it. The Presbyterian mode of worship is, unquestionably, in the same sense, as much a form as the Episcopal; and indeed there is a greater aim at effect in the Presbyterian mode, because the preacher will not be attended by the vulgar in shoals, except he preach to gratify their taste, and because their religion consists in preaching, not in prayer and praise. The use of the Geneva cloak is as essentially Popish, as is the surplice, if the latter is to be regarded as Popish; so also are the Presbyterian bands, so is the peculiar dress in which clergymen ordinarily appear. Sitting at the communion is a form; it is a posture of the body as well as kneeling; it is, moreover, the posture of the Pope. I maintain, therefore, that it was not Laud, but the Presbyterians, whether Puritans or Covenanters, who were sticklers for forms and ceremonies; who imagined they saw a merit placed in things which had actually none; who disputed as much about the mere act of genuflexion, as if it involved their salvation:—that in the indecent rudeness of Presbyterianism there is a greater attempt at effect than in the national and primitive ritual of the Church of England; that, in fine, in the public worship of Dissenters in general, not even excepting the fanaticism of the Quakers, if indeed *their* practice can be termed public worship, there is not an essential difference from the Church of

Rome, with this qualification, that the former are at one extreme and the Papists at another; yet both pretend self-denial, and both imagine that their outward acts of devotion are exclusively spiritual and holy.

While a detail of the tumults at Edinburgh was laid before the King, and while measures were in progress relative to future proceedings, the Presbyterians did not cease their private intrigues. It appears that the government of Scotland had been confided to a few individuals with whom the King consulted, all Scotsmen, and Lord Clarendon declares, that "there was so little curiosity either in the court or the country to know any thing of Scotland, or what was done there, that when the whole nation was solicitous to know what passed weekly in Germany and Poland, and all other parts of Europe, no man ever inquired what was doing in Scotland, nor had that kingdom a place or mention in one page of any gazette; and even after the advertisement of this preamble to rebellion, no mention was made of it at the Council Board, but such a dispatch made into Scotland upon it, as expressed the King's dislike and displeasure, and obliged the Lords of the Council there to appear more vigorously in the vindication of his people, and suppression of those tumults." In the mean time, the faction increased in strength and virulence; the very women were practised on by them; and some of their ladies of rank and influence entered the lists against the Church, in this "holy" cause. They declared themselves in favour of the tumult, and

stimulated their husbands also to engage in the warfare; and so successful were those devout matrons, that the prelates were compelled to betake themselves to their several dioceses, to avoid public insults, in a city where even their lives were in danger. It is almost incredible to relate the extent of this female phrensy, which the leaders of the faction found of the utmost advantage to their cause: nor are those devout matrons spared by Lysimachus Nicanor, "of the Society of Jesu," who in his "Epistle Congratulatorie to the Covenanters of Scotland," has exposed them by a satire as just as it is indelicate. "This violence of the women," says Lysimachus to the Covenanters, "hath the seeds of a holy mind, and they, being free citizens, ought to have full freedom; their tongues are their own; what lord can controul them[1]?" It must be confessed, that the epistolary correspondence which the Scottish preachers carried on with the female enthusiasts of that age, is deserving of the severest reprobation; religion was brought into contempt by the ideas mutually entertained by those "devout matrons," and their "spirit-stirring confessors" of the Covenant; and the language of some of them, particularly of Livingstone and Rutherford, specimens of whose *elegantiæ* might easily be produced from their printed letters, was not only ex-

[1] The Epistle Congratulatorie, &c. 4to. 1640. p. 73, 74, 75. This production, I find, was written by a Scotsman named Corbet, who was afterwards a Clergyman of the Irish Church. Carte's Ormond, folio, vol. i. p. 96.

travagant, but gross and licentious in no ordinary degree [1].

[1] To prove what I assert, without again referring to the Epistle Congratulatorie, or to the fanatical preacher who openly insulted King James from the pulpit, and descended from the same, leaving the *Kirk*, together with *the whole wives* present, a female enthusiast thus writes to Livingstone: "We long ernestly for you,—if ye disappoint me—I will say na mair. Cum and mak us amends for all faults. John Gray, your young bab, longs for the pap, blessed be God for that change. We have all neid of you. If you cum not, it will grieve me, therefore mak na excusis. Pray ernistly for us, never sic need." She adds, as an additional excitement to the preacher, "Your clais are heir, quilk ye left us to mak us the mor sur of you, and yet ye faild us. Do not so now, for fear *we poind your nicht-cap*." This letter is dated June, 1629, and addressed "to my worthy and loving brother, Mr. John Livingston, preacher of the word of God." (Note apud Kirkton, by C. K. Sharpe, Esq. p. 51.) Kirkton, a famous apostle, when publicly praying for a woman, exclaimed, "A wholesome disease! good Lord! a wholesome disease! Lord! for the soul. Alas! few in the land are troubled with the disease! Lord, grant that she may have many fellows in this disease!" The women, moreover, during the Covenanting rebellion, frequently stimulated their husbands to die for the "*gude auld cause*." But the "Letters" of the famous Samuel Rutherford, Professor of Divinity at St. Andrew's, whom Swift, in his notes on Burnet, asserts to have been half-fool, half-mad, are the most remarkable. Both these and his sermons are a mass of blasphemy, obscenity, and nonsense, particularly his epistles to the "godlie ladies." The reader will find proofs in a small and rare volume, entitled, "Presbyterian Eloquence displayed," the author of which has by no means exaggerated. Rutherford's "sublimities in devotion" are scarcely equalled, even by the extravagant sectaries which sprang up after the fall of the Church in England. Rutherford was called by his fanatical brethren "the flower of the Church," and the follow-

The riot at St. Giles's was countenanced and commended by the Presbyterian ministers, who re-

ing specimen of his nonsense, blasphemy, and obscenity, will shew this Presbyterian flower in his true light, regarding his pulpit eloquence. "The saints hes set up stoupps and way marks in every lair, and cryes ryd aboot, howbeit, fooles too many will throw at the nearest, and stick there: the saints going before is a benefit to us, we see the pooles and stanks [ditches] that encumbered them. Hold off adulterie, David stuck in that laire. Hold off drunkenness, Noah and Lot weat their feet in that dub. Beware to persecute and mock the saints. Paul's ship had almost sunk in that sand. See the dead carcases lying in the gate, Judas, Demas, Hymeneus, and Philotes, brak their necks in making a visit to Canaan. Mak this use of holy men's lives, here condemned, that followed the devil's cloud of witnesses, the world, and the fashions thereof, Rom. xii. Be not ye conform to the world, follow not their guyses, and yet we can justifie all the ill we doe. Wherefore is vanities in marriages and banquets, it is the fashion, say they. Wherefore vanitie of apparel, so that women are turned guysers and monsteres. It is the fashion, say they. O proud and poor Scotland! men cutted out to the skin, and women wants not vanity; but they are not cutted to the bone, wherefrae comes whoring, swearing, drinking. Whom see ye otherwise? says they, is not this the fashion of this age? but if ye but follow such a cloud of witnesses, let me conclude, run to hell too, for I assure you that is the fashion. 'Let us run the race.'—Demas gallopped awhile after the gospel, and Paul thought it a hungrie gate, and the world crossed his gate, the world in her silks and velvets, like a faire strumpet, ran in his way, and gave him a kiss, and he to the gate, sorrow of his part of any more of the gospel. The third sort is those that hes some more love to this race, and yet they cannot away with the world, like a young man (Matt. xix. 2. 22.), that ran to Christ and said, he keeped the commandments from his youth; when Christ bad him goe

flected upon it with peculiar satisfaction. It was extolled from their pulpits, and the actors in it were declared "the most heroic spirits that ever God inspired and raised in this last age of the world:" thanks were actually offered for "the happy mouths and hands which God had honoured that day with the beginning of their blessed reformation." A royal proclamation had enjoined that for every parish two of the Books of Common Prayer should be purchased, and, as this order was enforced, a petition was presented against it by Henderson and other chiefs of the faction, who had been practising among the people with great secresy and diligence. This petition was secretly encouraged by Traquair, though it was ably answered by the Bishop of Ross, who informed them, that though "they pretended ignorance of what is contained in the book, it appears, by their many objections and exceptions to almost all parts of it, that they are too well versed in it, but have abused

and sell all he had and give it to the poor, and come and follow him; he went away with his head in his hose, looked as if his nose wer bleeding, for he had great possessions. Wilt thou mak Christ a pack-horse to carrie thy clay and thy lusts? how long is it since he behoved to carrie thy pockmantie? believe me, he is no cadger horse; Judas, and Demas, and the like, that would have ridden upon Christ with all their bags of clay, ken ye how Christ did wi' them? he flang them and their clay aff at the road-side, and let them ly ther, and posted away." Sermon by that *flower of the Church*, Mr. Samuel Rutherford, 4to. What a contrast between the above nonsense, which is a fair specimen of the Presbyterian devotions of that age, and the works of the English Clergy of the same period!

it pitifully:—that not the General Assembly, which consists of a multitude, but the Bishops, have authority to govern the Church, and are the representative Church of the kingdom:—that they (Henderson and his associates,) will never be able, (do what they can) to prove what is contained in the Service-Book to be either superstitious or idolatrous, but that it is one of the most orthodox and perfect Liturgies in the Christian Church[1]." These remarks were, of course, unpalatable to this Presbyterian convert; although the petition was received with more respect than it deserved, he desisted not from his intrigues: two of the ministers of Edinburgh, named Rollock and Ramsay, had been suspended for not reading the Liturgy, and these two assisted in influencing the public mind. Matters were hastening to a crisis: the malecontents had by this time determined not to be reconciled on any terms: they had seized the favourable moment; and their plans had been long matured.

Some farther disturbances took place at Edinburgh in the month of September, not, however, of serious consequence; on which occasions the magistrates wrote to Archbishop Laud, "thanking his Grace for his kind letter from their hearts," and informing him, "that since their last (letter) there hath been such an innumerable confluence of people from all corners of this kingdom, both of clergy and laity, and of all degrees, by reason of two council days,

[1] Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 394, 395.

and such things suggested to these poor ignorant people, that they had erased what they (the magistrates), by great and continual pains, had implanted in their minds, and diverted them altogether from their former resolutions:" at the same time assuring the Archbishop of their resolution to co-operate with all his Majesty's wishes, not doubting but they would ultimately prevail, and beseeching his Grace that he would recommend them to his Majesty's favour. This letter having been received about the time that a petition had been forwarded to the King against the Liturgy, he thence inferred that those malcontents had other designs than the mere remonstrance against his royal proclamation; at all events, it was a justification and approval of the disgraceful riot to petition at such a juncture. These petitions were, consequently, coldly received: the King blamed the Scottish Council for timidity or backwardness in not punishing this rebellion; commanded that every bishop should order the Book of Common Prayer to be used in his diocese, and that no person should be chosen to fill any civil office who would not conform to his injunctions.

I am not altogether disposed to blame this procedure. It was, perhaps, peremptory and impolitic; nevertheless, the zealots who countenanced the riot, were not disposed to be satisfied with moderate compliances. To gratify their humours was to encourage their sedition; and, as they aimed at the destruction of the Church, there was no middle course to be adopted. Had the people not been

practised on and deluded by the false representations of the Presbyterian preachers, they would have offered little opposition to a service so admirably calculated to encourage purity of devotion; and they would, doubtless, have become gradually attached to a Church, whose ministers, residing among them, would have trained them to that purity of sentiment which the enthusiasm of the opposite party had so fearfully counteracted. For I hold, that the excellence of the public Liturgy the more plainly appears the oftener it is perused; and, consequently, a restraint would have been laid on those extravagances which the enthusiasm of the times was so apt to engender. The magistrates of Edinburgh, in their letter to Archbishop Laud, had rightly observed, that the people had received impressions from designing men. Hitherto those civilians had laboured to promote the introduction of the Liturgy with the greatest zeal, and their conduct had received the Archbishop's express approbation. These facts were well known to the populace, who, at the instigation of their leaders, had actually intruded themselves into their council room, and declared that they would not depart, till they were assured that the magistrates would sign their intended supplications. This led them to alter their measures, and in their letters to the Archbishop, before cited, they found it necessary to explain their peculiar circumstances [1].

[1] The Magistrates of Edinburgh to Archbishop Laud, 26th September, 1637.

The rural occupation of the harvest had produced, however, a temporary tranquillity, and the employments of the sickle and the labours of the husbandman, suspended for a while the popular exasperation. But it had not subsided: that indignation was only slumbering, which was to burst forth with redoubled fury: and, although there was a partial calm, the opposition to the Liturgy had increased throughout the kingdom. Men in the fields talked of their future exploits, and cherished their animosity: it was the language of the peer, the merchant, and the husbandmen: the women joined in the almost universal execration: and the preachers, in their weekly extemporaneous effusions, inflamed their zeal by their wild and ranting declamations. A minister in the diocese of Glasgow, that renowned country for covenanting chivalry, had preached a sermon at the opening of the provincial synod by the appointment of the Archbishop, in which, with great learning and moderation, he defended the Liturgy. His exhortations, however, were heard by the ignorant zealots with bursts of indignation. In the evening of that day he was attacked by a band of enraged women, and with difficulty escaped from being sacrificed on the spot, a victim to their fanaticism[1].

But no sooner were the labours of the harvest brought to a close, than vast multitudes resorted to the Scottish metropolis. It had been rumoured that a

[1] Wodrow MSS. vol. iii.

royal answer would be received to their petitions on the 18th of October, and this report having been industriously circulated, it was believed that this answer would be decisive. Alarmed at this threatening assemblage, the Scottish Privy Council issued three proclamations, in the hope of preserving the public peace. The first declared, that a royal proclamation had prohibited the Privy Council to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs; and that the Council should be dissolved on that day, (October 17,) and all strangers were ordered to depart from Edinburgh within twenty-four hours, except those who had warrant to remain from the Lords of the Council. The second proclamation made known, that the Council and Session were, by order of his Majesty, removed first to Linlithgow, and then to Dundee, during his Majesty's pleasure; and the third was against a seditious book which had been most widely circulated, published in 4to, entitled "A Dispute against the English Popish Ceremonies obtruded upon the Kirk of Scotland," which "had been sent abroad and dispersed in this kingdom, purposely to stir the hearts and affections of his Majesty's subjects from their due obedience and allegiance," and threatening punishment against those who should afterwards be found to have it in their possession [1].

But to the first proclamation no attention was paid by the congregated multitude. Their leaders,

[1] Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 400—405.

too, had assembled, under the auspices of Lords Balmerino and Loudon, with Henderson and Dickson, who had taken due care to be attended by others of their brethren. They had determined to resist, and at once to declare their opposition to the clergy, to whom they ascribed the proclamations. It was resolved that a paper should be drawn out, and subscribed by all those who would make a common cause with Balmerino; and Henderson prepared one paper, Loudon and Dickson another. One of these was adopted after some slight alterations, and was speedily circulated throughout the kingdom, to indicate those designs which their leaders had in contemplation [1].

No man can doubt that this tumult was premeditated; the deliberation, the caution, the intrigues of the Presbyterian preachers, evince their sedition. Had it been the burst of the moment, when the judgments even of the best of men are liable to be perverted, and to err from mistaken motives; or when, unable to restrain their enthusiasm, their passions obtain a transient triumph over their reason, there had been some excuse, and in moments of calm reflection they would at least have paused before they took arms against their sovereign. The mistaken motives of such a procedure would have entitled men to respect. But this was a faction, composed of violent men, who deliberately met to involve their country in rebellion; who, stimulated

[1] Bishop Guthrie's Memoirs, p. 26.

by the principles directly opposed to that religion they professed, scrupled not to disseminate their sedition, to excite to war and bloodshed; it was planned and executed with the most consummate wickedness of intention; it was to inflame the passions of the ignorant by false representations.

While these rebellious schemes were in progress, the metropolis again became the scene of tumult and disgraceful riot. On the 18th of October, the day after the proclamation had been issued, the multitude displayed their vengeance. Dr. Thomas Sydserf, Bishop of Galloway, in passing along the streets, was beset by the ferocious rabble, who first treated him with hootings and execrations, and then opposed his progress to the chamber of the Privy Council. Thither with difficulty the prelate at length arrived; but, instead of finding there a security from Presbyterian fury, he found the other members of the Council in the same situation as himself,—besieged by a daring mob, who threatened their destruction, and especially that of the bishop, whose person they demanded with loud and clamorous outcries. The Earls of Traquair and Wigton, hearing of the prelate's danger, to the former of whom he had been preceptor, hastened to his assistance, but they were received in nearly a similar manner. As this formidable riot seemed to increase, and as there was no possibility of escape, the noblemen sent to the magistrates to inform them of their distressing situation, and to crave assistance. But these civilians were in no better situation them-

selves; they happened that day to be holding a common council, and as the chief magistrate was peculiarly obnoxious to the rabble, the outrage had extended to him and his brethren. A disorderly body of rioters, who patroled the streets, surrounded the building, and forcibly entered the council room, where they vowed the immediate destruction of the civic authorities, if they would not that moment sign their paper against the Service-Book, and restore the suspended ministers. Resistance in such a situation was vain, and they complied with their demands. Traquair and Wigton, when the answer was returned to them, at the hazard of their lives went in person to the council room, where they found the exasperation of the rioters assuaged by the magistrates' signing the paper. Thinking that the outrage would now be quelled, those noblemen returned to protect the Bishop; but no sooner did they appear, than they were furiously attacked. Terrible outcries were raised: "God defend those that defend God's cause!" they wildly exclaimed, "God confound the Service-Book, and all its maintainers!" Men and women actually skipped in the streets, actuated by this religious madness. Instantly Traquair was attacked with outrageous fury; his hat and cloak were pulled off, the white rod of his office, as Lord Treasurer, was broken in pieces; he was thrown down in the street; and, had he not been aided by his attendants, who raised him, and carried him back to the Privy Council, he would have been trodden to death. Both the magistrates

and the members of the Council were now closely besieged in their several chambers, and they were at length compelled to seek aid from some of those noblemen who were favourable to the rioters. At the command of their leaders, the multitude dispersed, and the members of the Council were escorted home in safety; the Bishop of Galloway to his own residence, and the Earl of Traquair to the palace of Holyrood House[1].

This was the second exploit of the Presbyterians in their intended reformation, which, they declared, "God even to a miracle had prospered in their hands." The example was speedily followed in other parts of the kingdom, with the exception of Aberdeen, where the clergy and people still held fast their loyal integrity. On the afternoon of this day, a proclamation was issued from the palace of Holyrood-house, by the Privy Council, for repressing these disorders in future. It had, however, no effect. On the following day, public deputies from the people presented two petitions; the one from the noblemen, barons, burgesses, and commons; the other from the men, *women*, and CHILDREN, of the city of Edinburgh, against the Canons and the Book of Common Prayer. The former was trans-

[1] Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 400—404. Heylin, 331, 332. Bishop Guthrie, p. 24, 25. Large Declaration, p. 34—38. Hardwick's State Papers, vol. ii. p. 95. Burnet's Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, p. 33. Arnot's History of Edinburgh, 4to. p. 110, 111.

mitted to London; while the Earls of Roxburgh and Traquair proceeded to the King, to inform him of these disorders. The leaders of the faction, in the mean time, proceeded in their schemes with alacrity. A proposal was made by Henderson, aided by Balmerino, and Sir Thomas Hope, the King's Advocate, that though they had formerly opposed only the Service-Book, they should now include the Bishops, as enemies to religion, and demand that justice might be done against them. This proposal, a sufficient indication of the designs of Henderson and his associates, was at first opposed by many, who declared, "that they had no quarrel with the bishops, but merely wished to be freed from the Service-Book." Threats and promises, however, were held out, and at length the proposal was formally adopted. It was subscribed by those present, and ordered to be circulated throughout the kingdom, that it might receive an universal sanction, and be remitted on the ensuing fifteenth of November. The preachers returned home, and during the interval conducted themselves in the most outrageous manner. They preached damnation from the pulpits to those who would not subscribe; while the most awful anathemas were pronounced against the regular clergy. On the appointed day, a vast multitude repaired to Edinburgh with their several petitions. These were headed by some of the nobles, and all the seditious zealots in the land. The famous Marquis of Montrose, afterwards a martyr for his loyalty, formed one of this conclave;

and his military fame was a source of considerable disquietude to the Church.

The Privy Council no longer met at Edinburgh, but was ordered to Linlithgow, and thence to Stirling, both ancient and venerable seats of Scottish royalty. The return of Traquair to Scotland unfolded the measures of the court; the advices of that nobleman to the English government had been suspected, and, though, perhaps, his designs went no farther, it was not without sufficient grounds that he was viewed as a secret member of this opposition [1]. The King had recourse to a proclamation, which was issued at Stirling on the 19th of February, 1638. Here, for the first time, he experienced an act of deliberate rebellion. To issue proclamations to fanatics was truly useless; they spurned at the language of the King. Though he solemnly protested that he abhorred all the superstitions of Popery, and intended to do nothing contrary to the ancient laws of the kingdom, they set at defiance his injunctions to conduct themselves peaceably, and to abstain from outrage. The proclamation was opposed by a protest at Stirling that very day, and the protest was repeated on two successive days at Edinburgh and Linlithgow. Wherever, in fact, the royal proclamation was published, the zealots were ready with their protest. The King's authority was abjured, and the combination now declared its intentions. Their protest consisted of

[1] Burnet's Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, p. 33.

six particulars, all sufficiently treasonable. Armed men assembled under their auspices; Calvinism was triumphant; and schism and rebellion, its twin sisters, went hand in hand [1].

In pursuance of the designs of the abettors of this extraordinary and daring conduct, they now began to erect a government of their own; which may well vie with any despotism which ever existed on earth. The multitude of enthusiasts which resorted to Edinburgh, rendered it necessary that they should be divided into classes, which they termed *Tables*, from which deputies were elected, who together composed a *General Table* for the superintendence of the deliberations of the inferior ones. Of the subordinate, there were four *Tables:* one for the ministers, one for the nobility, one for the gentry, and one for the boroughs. No tyranny could be more complete than that exercised by the deputies; they issued their orders without control, and these every where received the most implicit obedience. It was expressly declared, too, that their government was to be independent of the King. No individual connected with it was to be answerable to the laws [2].

Had Charles followed up his proclamations by a powerful army; had he, instead of allowing the enthusiasts to imagine that he was afraid and timid,

[1] Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 730—734. Large Declaration, p. 50—52. Lord Clarendon, vol. i. 4to. p. 163. Heylin, p. 333.

[2] Burnet's Memoirs, p. 32, 33. Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 734. Guthrie's Memoirs, p. 27. Whitelocke's Memorials, p. 27.

put in practice the most salutary punishments, aided by a strong military force, there can be little doubt that the refractory zealots would have met with a complete discomfiture. But the King's amiable and humane disposition was the occasion of his misfortunes. He imagined that the first outrage was the act of enthusiasm; that the fear of punishment kept the leaders together, and that tranquillity would be restored if this fear was removed. This moderation and leniency were unhappily misapplied, and the King had recourse to force when it was too late; when the English Puritans made a common cause with the Scottish fanatics; when the crown was insulted, and his life at stake.

This was the first step towards the introduction of the well known Solemn League and Covenant. For this mode of procedure, the Scots had from the first a decided predilection. Under the auspices of Knox various covenants had been formed, by which the Lords of the Congregation associated together in their opposition to the Romish Church. Whatever might have been the necessity of it in those days, the present circumstances rendered the conduct of the insurgents altogether unwarrantable. Though they adopted the inflammatory manifestoes published by Knox and his brethren against the Queen Regent, they forgot that there was not, in the present case, the most distant similarity. Then there was an attack on their liberties; now there was none: then the superstitions of Rome were forcibly maintained; now that Church had fallen

for ever. Here, however, let me introduce the sentiments of the learned historian of the Church of Scotland; himself a minister of the Presbyterian Church. "There was," says this eloquent writer, "an essential difference in the situation of the first Reformers and that of their successors. The intrepid men who attacked the Popish establishment long contended only for toleration; and when this was denied, they were compelled to struggle for liberty, without which their consciences would have been shackled, their religion persecuted, and they themselves deprived of property, of honour, and of life. Infatuated as Charles was, *he threatened no such evils.* In the ardour of party zeal, it was indeed strongly insinuated, that he was steadily prosecuting the design of restoring Popery, but there is not the slightest evidence to support the insinuation. The amount of the religious calamities which the inhabitants of Scotland had to dread was the continuance of Episcopacy, or the attempt to continue it; but it surely may be doubted how far this was, at the commencement of the disturbances, a sufficient cause for actually resisting the sovereign. Many of the clergy who joined in opposition to government had at this period no idea that Episcopacy was subversive of Christianity; *all of them* had sworn obedience to the bishops in whose dioceses they ministered; and some of them expressly distinguished between Episcopacy as it existed in the time of Knox's superintendence, and the Episcopacy which now was opposed, affirming that both indeed

ought to be removed, but that the former ought not to be abjured[1]."

In this pretended zeal for religion, the insurgents now came to a desperate conclusion. As I have observed, they had sufficient precedents to fortify their covenanting notions. No sooner, therefore, was the idea proposed, than the device, says Burnet, took as if it were an oracle. It was the object of the insurgents to promote that enthusiasm for their cause which had been widely disseminated; and they contrived this device, which succeeded to a miracle. King James had caused a confession to be drawn up, containing a renunciation of the Popish errors, which he himself signed, and was followed by the people. This confession or covenant was now renewed; but while the enthusiasts asserted, with their usual confidence, that it was the same as the original, they had altered it to suit their fanaticism and sedition, though they still denominated it by its former title—a cunning expedient, in unison with their general conduct: "by which imposition," says the noble historian, "people of all ranks, supposing it might be a means to extinguish the present fire, with all alacrity engaged themselves in it; whereas in truth, they had inserted a clause, never before heard of, and quite contrary to the end of that covenant, whereby they obliged themselves to pursue the extirpation of bishops,

[1] Dr. Cook's (formerly Minister of Laurencekirk, now Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of St. Andrew's), History of the Church of Scotland from the Reformation, vol. ii. p. 415, 416.

and had the confidence to demand the same in express terms of the King, in answer to a very gracious message the King had sent them [1]." In this state of things the prospect was deplorable; enthusiasm is contagious, among ignorant zealots it soon reaches to rebellion.

Of this celebrated Covenant and Solemn League, one of the most treasonable and impious bonds which was ever devised, I shall say little. Mr. Archdeacon Echard asserts, that the original is preserved in Trinity College, Cambridge. I have, however, seen it with all the original signatures in the Library of the Faculty of Advocates, Edinburgh. This monument of sedition and bloodshed, which is still beheld by the Presbyterian sectaries in Scotland, and enthusiasts of that creed in general, as the triumph of their faith, was ushered in by a command issued by the *Tables*, that a solemn meeting should be held in Edinburgh, where they resolved to try the expedient. A fast was also appointed, and the preachers were not forgetful of the "good old cause." The Covenant was prepared by Henderson, and a lawyer named Archibald Johnston, afterwards exalted to a temporary peerage by the usurper Cromwell, by the title of Lord Warriston, and revised by the Earl of Rothes, Lords Balmerino, and Loudon. Framed to defy the royal power, and to encourage bigotry and fanaticism, the King's Advocate, Sir Thomas Hope, nevertheless, aided it, though it was the duty of that functionary to punish

[1] Lord Clarendon, vol. i. p. 163.

the enthusiasts. It consists of a renunciation of Popery, expressed in a violence of language and invective, cunningly adapted to inflame the resentment of the people, scarcely one of whom understood what he was renouncing, or had any idea of the nature of the epithets employed by the seditious leaders against the Romish Church. It professed to contain a declaration of the Reformed faith, and to enumerate all the errors of popery. A bond was added, compelling the subscribers to resist all religious innovations under the general names of Popery, heresy, and superstition; they were to swear that they would defend each other against all who should oppose them; and this they impiously said was for the glory of God, and the honour and safety of their King and country, while the most terrific denunciations and execrations were uttered against those who opposed the Covenant, or refused to subscribe [1].

On the 1st of March, 1638, this Solemn League was subscribed in the Greyfriars' church, Edinburgh, after it had been read aloud to the enthusiastic multitude. Henderson insulted Heaven by offering an extemporaneous prayer for a blessing, after which the Earl of Loudon made a long hypocritical address on the importance of the Covenant [2]. No-

[1] King's Declaration, p. 57—66. Bishop Guthrie's Memoirs, p. 30.

[2] This nobleman, one of the great lay chiefs of the Covenanters, was a man of bad morals; and Bishop Burnet assures us, that his wife, to whom, being an heiress, he was indebted for all his fortune, threatened him with a process for adultery, of which

thing more was requisite to excite the passions. A parchment scroll was kept for the insertion of names, and the enthusiasts pressed forward to sign it, as if it was an insertion of their names in the Book of Life. Some of the enthusiasts, as I have seen in the original document, were so zealous, that they added after their signatures, "*till death.*"

This example was followed in many places of the kingdom: yet, in some parts, the Covenant was coldly received. In the city of Glasgow, the clergy

she had undoubted proof, if he would not assist the Covenanters, and break certain engagements he had made to the King while he was in England. See also Lamont's Diary, p. 38. Yet Samuel Rutherford scruples not to address this most unprincipled nobleman in the following blasphemous terms: "You come out to the streets with Christ on your forehead, when many are ashamed of him, and hide him under their cloaks as if he were a *stolen Christ.*" And again, in an epistle dated Jan. 4, 1638, this enthusiast writes, "Blessed are ye of the Lord: your name and honour shall never rot nor wither in heaven (at least), if ye deliver the Lord's sheep that have been scattered in a dark and cloudy day, out of the hands of strange lords and hirelings, who with rigour and cruelty have caused them to eat the pastures trodden upon with their foul feet, and to drink muddy water, and who have spun out such a world of yards of indifferences in God's worship, to make and weave a web for the Antichrist, (that shall not keep any from the cold) as they mind nothing else but that by the bringing in of the Pope's foul tail first upon us (their wretched and beggarlie ceremonies), they may thrust in after them the Antichrist's legs and thighs, and his belly, head and shoulders, and then cry down Christ and the gospel, and up the merchandise and wares of the great whore."

not only shewed a disinclination to subscribe it, but even censured the enthusiasts; in St. Andrew's, it was resisted by the influence of the primate: while at Aberdeen, it met with most decided opposition from the influence of the University, which remained unshaken in its loyalty. The missionaries of the Covenant were now dispatched throughout the country on a regular crusade against the government: the pulpits of the fanatics every where resounded with their impious declamations. Prynne had declared in England that *Christ was a Puritan:* in Scotland it was actually said that *Christ was a Covenanter;* he was the "covenanted Jesus," and they talked most whiningly to the vulgar of their "covenanted God" and "covenanted Kirk:" they had, they said, "a covenanted bridegroom," and they would have a "covenanted King." A fanatic named Cant, one of their few partizans in the north, in a sermon at Glasgow, told the people, that "he was sent to them with a commission from Christ to bid them subscribe, it being Christ's contract: that he came as a wooer for the bridegroom, to call upon them to be hand-fasted, by subscribing the contract: that he would not depart till he had got the names of all refusers, of whom he would complain to his Master[1]." Every where threats, promises, and all kinds of inducements, were employed to prevail

[1] This enthusiast, according to Mr. Addison, (Spectator, vol. ii. No. 147.) was the author of *canting*, and the specimen above is conclusive of the fact, that is, of speaking unintelligible jargon.

upon the people to sign the bond. The venerable Archbishop Spottiswoode declared on this occasion, "Now all that we have been doing for these thirty years past is thrown down at once." The Covenant, in short, was their idol: no Papist ever looked with more reverence on the mass, than the Presbyterians did on their Solemn League: their faith consisted in it, they actually thought there was no salvation without subscribing it; no relics were ever cherished by a devotee with more devotion than was the Covenant by the Scottish Presbyterians. They were told by their preachers "to acquit themselves like men;" curses were thundered against those "who went not out to help the angel of the Lord against the mighty;" libels were dispersed throughout England, since the pulpits could not convey their sedition fast enough, justifying their proceedings to their Puritan brethren, who, as Archbishop Laud well remarks, "held a correspondence with them:" the English nation were incited to the like great achievement: a fanatic refused to pray for the chief magistrate of Edinburgh, then dying, because he had not subscribed it: the preachers refused to administer the holy communion to those who did not idolize that seditious bond, and, in their exhortations at their communion tables, termed them unblushingly, "Adulterers, Atheists, Slanderers, Blasphemers." One fanatic declared from the pulpit, that the "non-subscribers to the Covenant were Atheists;" a second exhorted his hearers not to desist *till the King*

was in their power, and then he would see what good subjects they were. Some declared, that "the Service-book was framed at Rome:" and one preacher maintained "that the wrath of God would never leave the kingdom till all the prelates were hanged up before the Lord, like the seven sons of Saul." Their pulpits they termed "chairs of truth:" as for themselves, they were "the Lord's elected people," and one of them had the assurance to declare, that the "Covenant was an *offering to God!*"

But the most extraordinary mission of those enthusiasts was directed towards Aberdeen; for throughout the north their hypocrisy had always been detested, and, amid all the changes, that city and University remained firm in Episcopal loyalty. This mission was composed of Henderson, the high priest of the Covenant, Dickson, and Cant, who were all three thereafter termed the *Apostles of the Covenant;* the Earl of Montrose, Lord Coupar, and Lord Kinghorn. The inhabitants of the northern counties were as enthusiastic in their attachment to Episcopacy, as the zealots of the southern were to Presbytery, and they accordingly manifested the greatest opposition. Henderson and his associates repaired to the University of King's College, and there held long disputations with the doctors of that once famous Episcopal establishment, founded by the venerable Bishop Elphinstone in 1491. In vain, however, were those theologians assailed by the Covenanting zealots: the groaning, whining

eloquence of the latter was despised; in a solemn dispute all their arguments against Episcopacy were refuted. This controversy was published, and the Covenanters so well remembered this defeat, that they forced those theologians, a short time afterwards, to consult their safety by flight. Aberdeen at that time contained a Forbes and a Scougall. It was in vain that Henderson urged the divine authority of Presbytery; he was soon dislodged from his positions: his sophistical logic was easily detected and exposed. The heads of the University proved the Covenant to be impious and illegal, and utterly incompatible with the principles of government. It was easier, however, to refute those men, than to silence them. The account of this disputation is still extant, and reflects great honour on the memory of the learned and loyal men who at that time adorned this northern seminary. Henderson and his colleagues made few converts in that quarter, and they returned in great haste to the districts which abounded with their devotees [1].

Thus I have given a hasty sketch of those important transactions, necessary in this place, because they occurred in the times of Archbishop Laud, and because that prelate has been charged as the cause of driving the Scots to this Covenant, by endeavouring to impose on them "a religion of his own." Of the Covenant I shall yet have occasion to speak. From this time, till the year 1660, hy-

[1] Bishop Guthrie's Memoirs. Spalding's History, vol. i.

pocrisy and fanaticism triumphed in Scotland for more than twenty years—but what eventful years! Over these transactions of impiety and rebellion, as well as the blasphemous language of their authors, the veil ought to be drawn. It is not my province to inquire whether Scotland has gained by this transaction, or whether she has gained by the then transient and at length final fall of the Episcopal Church in 1688, when that Church ceased to be established by law. It is matter of considerable doubt; at best, however, it would now be one of idle speculation. By a wise dispensation of Providence, the most tremendous revolutions, and the most signal national calamities, are frequently attended with advantages, or, at least advantages, result from a combination of causes. That Church still exists, though no longer national; poor, indeed, and humble, but primitive in its forms, its clergy steadily maintaining apostolical order and truth; and, (notwithstanding the fulminations of Covenanters,) precious, I know well, are the associations of that humble communion to its members; dear to them are its altars; they preserve towards it the affection and devotion of children to a parent. And the review of those scenes of violence and fanaticism now recorded, teaches us most important and salutary lessons. They disclose to us the mutability of human affairs; the dangerous tendency of faction, sectarianism, and schism. From them we learn that religion may be perverted, and, instead of becoming the promoter of peace and

good-will, be made the pretext for the most daring and desperate designs; and that they alone are the lovers of their country, who lend not an ear to novelties, but look with respect and reverence on the venerable institutions of their fathers. No guilt could be greater than that of the Covenanters; it was a dark and daring plot, it was what they had been long preparing with indefatigable diligence. They deceived the ignorant by hypocritical professions of regard to the sovereign's person, while at the same moment they declared that over them he had no control. They termed it loyalty, while with the same breath they inculcated treason: they said it was for the defence of pure religion, while their harangues and their writings abounded in blasphemy, folly, and obscenity. It was well termed by the King a "lewd Covenant and seditious bond annexed to it," and "the first dung which from these stables was thrown upon the face of authority and government." No man, then, can peruse this melancholy history without pitying a monarch whose generous purposes were frustrated by fanatics: and if, in the midst of this fermentation, we observe aught of heroism and magnanimity in the zealots, this must also be ascribed to the obstinacy which religious enthusiasm never fails to induce. Amid those unhappy ravages of passion, fallen magnificence meets our eye; and fanaticism stalks abroad with fearful and rapid progress. To doubt that many of them were sincere, would be to do them injustice: yet enthusiasm is not truth, nor is the

bigotry of party a proof of soundness of faith. Those men, nevertheless, are alone worthy of all honour and all renown, who, sincere in their religion, and tempered by the maxims of rational philosophy, know how to bridle their passions, to conquer their prejudices, and to avoid the dangerous extremes into which headstrong men are liable to rush; who preserve their judgment uncorrupted and uninfluenced by party. But those wild enthusiasts, on the other hand, forget themselves, they grovel on the earth, and lick its dust, adoring the caprices and the power of tyrants, who are under the control of ignorant or factious zealots, whose fanaticism is equally dangerous to religion and to civil order. Man is bound by divine and human laws to give due obedience to his superiors; from the moment of his birth he swears a tacit oath that he will not rebel; and if he does rebel, he has committed an outrage which demands summary punishment. There may be circumstances, indeed, which render resistance necessary; but those, too, have bounds, beyond which the injured cannot pass. But when prejudice triumphs over reason, and the fierceness of hate supplants the gentler sentiments; when there is a deaf ear turned towards every remonstrance; when human authority is despised and derided, and the madness of religious zeal perverts the mind, then it is that men become the slaves of their passions; an angel from heaven could not convince them. Thus it was in this covenanting association. Supported by fanatics, concessions made them only

the more violent; and, by their blasphemous appeals to Heaven, and daring execrations on the heads of those who partook not of their profanity, they terrified the weak-minded into a blind compliance. It was not a covenant of mutual defence only, but of war and extermination: toleration was declared a "hideous monster;" Scripture was cited for religious persecution. But, stimulated by religious madness and hypocritical cunning, what will not men do? Such excesses they imagine to be acceptable to a merciful Deity. Frantic with this unbridled spirit, the sword soon accompanies their sedition; their reason is obscured; their understandings are distracted; every plan for the public welfare is deranged; and their blood-thirsty fanaticism can only be appeased by destroying the objects of their detestation.

CHAPTER XVII.

1638.

The Archbishop's Diary—His cognizance of the Isles of Jersey and Guernsey—He publishes the second edition of his Conference—Libellous language of his enemies—The Archbishop converts Chillingworth—Notice of him—Vigilance of the Archbishop against Socinianism—He converts John Hales the "Ever Memorable"—Notice of him—His noble conduct—His interview with Laud—His troubles—Notice of his Works—Restraint of the Press—Holland—The Geneva Bible—New England—Intolerant conduct of the Sectaries there—Plans of the Archbishop—His visitation of Merton College.

I NOW turn to the Diary of the Archbishop, who has introduced this year by the following record: "April 29. The tumults in Scotland about the Service-book offered to be brought in, began July 23, 1637, and continued increasing by fits, and hath now brought that kingdom in danger. No question but there is a great concurrence between them and the Puritan party in England. A great aim there to destroy me in the King's opinion."

Before, however, referring again to Scotland, there are some events of this year, in the Archbishop's history, which are worthy of notice. It appears that a transient calm was then enjoyed in England,

from the Puritan party being apparently weakened and silenced. The metropolitan visitations had done much to compose disorders, while the vigilance of the Bishops carried into effect those instructions which their metropolitan had transmitted for the government of the Church. So indefatigable was the Primate, as we learn from Heylin, that he took cognizance of the islands of Jersey and Guernsey, on the coast of Normandy, and meditated an extraordinary visitation there in the ensuing spring, had not the affairs of Scotland rendered it impossible. Nevertheless, he was the means of inducing the King to establish some Fellowships at the Universities for students from those islands. "The islanders," says Heylin, "were in the habit of educating such of their sons as were designed for the ministry either at Lausanne or Geneva, whence they returned well seasoned with the leaven of Calvinism. No better way was there to purge that old leaven out of the islands, than to allure the people to send their children to Oxford or Cambridge,—for what else would ensue upon it, but that the educating of some such scholars from those islands at the University, where they might thoroughly acquaint themselves with the doctrines, government, and forms of the Church of England, and return to their native islands, inviting the inhabitants to conform, which, doubtless, would be done with honour to the King, content to himself, and satisfaction to the people[1]?"

[1] Heylin, p. 335, 336.

Nor was the Primate less indefatigable in his opposition to the Popish party. He was already in disgrace with the Queen on account of the speech which he had made against Walter Montague and Sir Toby Matthews, both of whom he had compelled to quit the country: nor did he less oppose the intrigues of Con, who had endeavoured in vain to ensure his favour. The malicious libels which had been published against him probably made him at this time hasty and passionate: but, certain it is, that he was more than usually active against the emissaries of Rome. This year he enlarged and reprinted his famous Conference with Fisher the Jesuit, which added much to his reputation. It was presented to the King on the 4th of February, and exposed for sale the ensuing day. I have already noticed it at great length, and it is unnecessary now to enter into detail. L'Estrange, who was by no means a friend to Laud, declares, that "it was the most exact masterpiece of polemic divinity then extant, in which he had for ever disabled the Papists from being so much their own as before."

Yet the dastardly enemies of this great man were relentless in their hatred. Dr. Heylin, his chaplain, had preached two masterly discourses against Popery, which occasioned the remark, "That the Doctor in those two sermons had pulled up Popery by the very roots." The Archbishop's work had just appeared, and a reply was made to this observation, "That the Archbishop might print, and the

Doctor might preach, what they pleased against Popery, but neither of them would be thought less a Papist, for so they would always be held[1]." This was truly the refinement of hatred, and the relation of it requires no other comment or aggravation. Yet this was not the utmost of the hatred manifested towards the Archbishop. Though his "Conference" had remained unanswered, even by the learned Jesuits and Priests of the Romish Church, and though it was universally admitted to be unanswerable, a volume appeared against him, entitled "A Reply to a Relation of the Conference between William Laud and Mr. Fisher the Jesuit, by a Witness of Jesus Christ." Had it not been for the fanatical designation which its ignorant author gives himself, it might have been thought to come from the pen of some learned ecclesiastic of the Romish Church. It is, however, a piece of Puritan absurdity and ignorance, only paralleled by the presumption of the author, who dedicates it to the King. Heylin declares that its author was a Presbyterian Scot, or, at least, it was rumoured to that effect.

But the Archbishop did not confine his labours solely to oppose Popery. It may here be observed, that it is owing to Archbishop Laud's exertions that the Church of England can claim the celebrated William Chillingworth as one of its illustrious sons. This learned man was born in the parish of St.

[1] Heylin, p. 338, 339.

Martin's, Oxford, in 1602; he was admitted Scholar of Trinity College in 1618. In 1620, he was admitted B.A. in 1623, M.A. and in 1628, Fellow of that society. At this period several Romish priests resided about Oxford, and among the rest Fisher, who had held the disputation with Laud. Chillingworth's reputation made Fisher anxious for his acquaintance, and the Jesuit at length succeeded in converting him. He was persuaded to retire to the College of the Jesuits at Douay; as the change of his religion made him resign his Fellowship, though he would have got better promotion from the Papists had he continued among them. Laud, who was his godfather, was not disposed thus to lose sight of him, and accordingly, while he was Bishop of London, in a correspondence which he held with him, he so pressed upon his notice the fallacies of the Romish Church, that he persuaded him to return to the Church of England. Chillingworth, by the advice of Laud, after leaving Douay, retired to Oxford, where, after thoroughly examining the Reformed doctrines, he published a refutation of the arguments by which he had been seduced; yet such, we are told, was the love of truth in this good man, that he scrupled not to re-examine the Protestant doctrines, in a letter to Dr. Sheldon, (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury,) which occasioned a report that he had turned Papist and Protestant a second time. The Presbyterian zealots, indeed, afterwards maintained, that he was always a Papist at heart. About the end of the year 1637,

he published his "Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation," in which he had been engaged for nearly three years[1]. During that interval he held several disputes with the Papists, but this book was designed as a reply to a Popish work written by Edward Knott, a Jesuit, who published it as a Reply to Dr. Potter's (Provost of Queen's College, Oxford,) excellent production, entitled, "Want of Charitie justly charged on all such Romanists as dare (without truth or modesty) affirme, that Protestantism destroyeth Salvation, in Answer to a late Pamphlet entitled 'Charity Mistaken,'" &c. which that Jesuit had published in 1634. The Jesuit's work, which called forth Chillingworth's treatise, was published in 1634, and is entitled, "Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained by Catholiques, by way of Reply upon an Answer lately framed by Dr. Potter, to a Treatise which had formerly proved that Charity was mistaken by Protestants: with the want whereof Catholiques are unjustly charged for

[1] "The Religion of Protestants, a safe way to Salvation, or an Answer to a book entitled Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained by Catholiques, which pretends to prove the contrary, by William Chillingworth, M.A. of the University of Oxford." This admirable production has gone through many editions, the first is 1638, at Oxford; the second, the same year, at London; the third, in 1664; the fourth, in 1674; the fifth, in 1684. In 1687, an edition of it was abridged and published by Dr. John Patrick, at the request of the Diocese of London. The sixth edition appeared in 1704; the seventh, in 1719; the eighth, a year or two after; and the ninth in 1727. This last is printed from the edition of 1664. The tenth and last is that of 1742, with the life of the author, by the Rev. Thomas Birch.

affirming that Protestancy destroys Salvation. Divided into two Parts." A very animated discussion arose between Chillingworth and his Popish opponents, which was carried on with considerable warmth on both sides for some time, through the medium of the press. This learned man published various other pieces under the title of Sermons, and particularly some masterly essays on the divine institution of Episcopacy. His MSS. which have not been published, are in the Library at Lambeth Palace, and are preserved among the MSS. of Henry Wharton, procured by Archbishop Tennison. These MSS. are extremely valuable; but I only give the titles of a few of them, as drawn up by Wharton himself, in the Catalogue he prepared, in which he observes that the volume marked M, is Volumen Chartaceum, in folio, and contains, "A Collection of Papers formerly belonging to Archbishop Laud, many of them written with his own hand, but most of them indorsed with his own hand, together with some papers of the Archbishops Sheldon and Sancroft, and many of Mr. Chillingworth." These are generally on controversial subjects. There is one, "A Treatise against the Scots;" a second, "Passages extracted out of the Declarations of the Scots;" a third, "Observations on the Scottish Declaration;" and a fourth, "A Treatise on the unlawfulnesse of resisting the lawful prince, although most impious, tyrannical, and idolatrous." These treatises, however, are numbered by Wharton from four to eight of Chillingworth's papers. It

may be proper to mention, that, in 1638, he was made Chancellor of Sarum, with the Prebend of Brixworth, Northamptonshire, annexed; and about the same time he was appointed to the Mastership of Wigstan's Hospital, Leicester. In 1640, he was proctor for Sarum in the Convocation. He was zealously attached to the King, and died a devoted Protestant loyalist in 1643-4. It was the recollection of what he had done for Chillingworth and others, which made Archbishop Laud disclaim with virtuous and noble indignation the charge of Popery, with which the tyrannical Parliament falsely accused him at his trial. Upwards of twenty persons he enumerates, most of them of the first rank and consequence, among whom were the Duke of Buckingham, the Marchioness of Hamilton, Lord Mayo, Sir William Webb, his kinsman, two of his daughters, and two daughters of Sir Richard Lechford, in Surrey. "Mr. Chillingwood's learning and abilities," said he to his inhuman judges, "are sufficiently known to your Lordships: he went and excelled at Douay. My letters brought him back, and he lived and died a defender of the Church of England. And that this is so, you cannot but know, for Mr. Prynne took away my letters, and all the papers which concerned him, and they were examined at the Committee[1]."

[1] History of Troubles and Trials, p. 221—227. Prynne, in commenting on this part of the Archbishop's defence, (p. 56, of Canterburie's Doome, as is noted by the learned Henry Wharton,) with his usual regard to truth, terms Chillingworth "a

While the Archbishop was thus watching sedulously against the prevalence of the Romish superstition, he was no less mindful of the ravages of sectarianism. The impieties of Socinianism had begun to extend universally among the Puritans, as they did rapidly among their descendants in the succeeding century; and indeed it could hardly fail to be otherwise, for Calvinism, which is in reality religious necessity, if carried to the extreme, is apt, as in the well known case of Dr. Priestley, to land its votaries eventually in the principles of pure Deism. And yet it is not easy to see how a man can be what is termed a *moderate Calvinist,* which is a mode of phraseology current among our modern evangelicals; in other words, a moderate Calvinist, is one who believes in predestination, and who does not believe in it; for the phrase literally signifies this absurd contradiction. A man must either admit

desperate apostate Papist." For various accounts of Chillingworth, see Wood's Athen. Oxon. vols. i. and ii. Historical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of William Chillingworth, &c. by M. De Maiseaux, London, 8vo. 1725. Fuller's Worthies of England, edit. 1662. Lacy's "Judgment of an University Man," &c. 4to. 1639, (this author was a Jesuit.) Bulstrode Whitelock's Letters, Rushworth's Collections, Remains of Archbishop Laud, vol. ii. Barlow's Genuine Remains. Digby's Letters. Birch's Life, prefixed to his edit. of "The Religion of Protestants." Knott's Works. Nalson's Impartial Collections, vols. i. and ii. Wharton MSS. Lord Clarendon's History of the Rebellion. Tillotson's Sermons, vol. xii. Sermon VI. Hare's Scripture Vindicated. Locke's Collections, Pieces, &c. &c. and Chillingworth's own Works.

Calvinism to the full extent, there being no middle course, or he must reject it altogether: for to say that there is redemption for all men who hear the gospel, if they repent and believe, and also to say that, nevertheless, none but the elect will be saved, is an absurd contradiction.—Laud had converted the learned and rational Chillingworth from the errors of Popery; the other great man whom he recovered was no other than that excellent divine and critic, John Hales, surnamed the "*Ever Memorable*," whom he caused to renounce the bold and damning errors of Socinianism, and to renounce those prejudices which he had imbibed against the apostolic constitution of the Church. This distinguished man was descended from an ancient family in Somersetshire, and was born in the parish of St. James, Bath, in 1584. In 1597, he was entered Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, where he took his first degree in Arts with great applause. By the persuasion of Sir Henry Savile, Warden of Merton College, who was anxious for the honour of that Society, he removed thither, and, in 1605, his merit procured for him the election of Fellow. Here he superintended an edition of St. Chrysostom's Works, in which he gave the most satisfactory proofs of his abilities, and of his profound knowledge in Greek literature. He was shortly afterwards appointed Greek lecturer to the College, and, in 1612, he received the appointment of public lecturer of Greek to the University. In 1613, he was chosen by the University to deliver the funeral oration

over that illustrious man, Sir Thomas Bodley, the founder of the Bodleian Library, of whom his country was deprived on the 13th of January, and Hales delivered the oration on the 29th of March. On the 24th of the following May, being in Holy Orders, he was admitted Fellow of Eton, and had the reputation of being one of the most eloquent preachers of his age. In 1618, he followed Sir Dudley Carleton, ambassador to the Hague, as chaplain, which gained him admission to the Synod of Dort, though he was not a member. At this time he was a rigid Calvinist, but the proceedings of that Synod gave him a disgust for the predestinarian dogmas; he became an Arminian, and the disciple of the learned Episcopius. It is said, in a letter written by one of his friends, that when Episcopius pressed on the Calvinists, St. John iii. 16, Hales "bid John Calvin good night." There is an anecdote, moreover, related by Dr. Walker, in the General Dictionary, that a friend of Hales, finding him one day perusing Calvin's Institutes, asked him, "If he was not yet past that book?" to which Hales answered, "In my younger days I read it to inform myself, now I read it to reform Calvin." It is not unlikely that he meditated a reply to that performance of Calvin, which the Puritans received with as much reverence as they did the Holy Gospels. We find Hales, in various places, expressing his opinions on predestination, particularly in his sermon on Rom. xiv. 1. printed in his "Golden Remains," where he advises his hearers "to think

that these things which, with some shew of probability, we adduce from Scripture, are at the best but *our opinions,* for that this peremptory manner of setting down our own conclusions under the high commanding form of necessary truths, is generally one of the greatest causes which keep the Christian Church this day so far asunder; whereas a gracious receiving of each other by mutual forbearance in this kind might peradventure bring them nearer together." His open disposition was well known, and Bishop Pearson informs us that "his chamber was a church, and his chair a pulpit." It was about this time that he became infected with Socinianism, or, at least, he was a Latitudinarian, probably because he had not thoroughly divested himself of his former tenets, as appears from his tract on Schism, which he wrote for his friend Chillingworth about the year 1636. Being informed that Archbishop Laud was displeased with it, he wrote a vindication of himself, and sent it to the Primate as a letter. In 1638, his Grace sent for him to Lambeth, where he had a conference with him for several hours. Dr. Heylin was present at this conference, and I therefore lay his account of it before the reader. "There had been published," says that learned writer, "a discourse called *Disquisitio Brevis,* in which some of the principal Socinian tenets were cunningly inserted, pretending that they were the best expedients to appease some controversies between us and Rome: the book was commonly ascribed to Hales of Eton, a man of extensive reading

and great ingenuity, free in discourse, and as communicative of his knowledge as the celestial bodies of their light and influence. There was circulated also a discourse on Schism, not printed, but transmitted from hand to hand in written copies, like the Bishop of Lincoln's Letter to the Vicar of Grantham, intended chiefly for the encouragement of some of our great masters of wit and reason, to despise the authority of the Church, which being dispersed about this time (1638,) gave the Archbishop occasion to send for him to Lambeth, in the hope that he might gain the man, with whose abilities he was well acquainted when he lived at Oxford,—an excellent Grecian in those days, and one whom Savile made great use of in his Greek edition of St. Chrysostom's Works. About nine in the morning, Hales came to Lambeth to know his Grace's pleasure, who took him along with him into the garden, commanding that none of the servants should interrupt him on any account. There they continued till the bell rang for prayers, after prayers were ended, till the dinner was ready, and after that, too, till the arrival of Lord Conway, and some other persons of distinction, made it necessary that some of the servants should inform his Grace that the time had passed away. So they came in, high coloured, and almost panting for breath, enough to shew that there had been some heats between them, not then fully cooled. It was my chance to be at the Palace that day, either to know his Grace's pleasure, or to render an account of some former

commands, I remember not at present which, and I found Hales glad to see me, as he was a stranger, and unknown to all. He told me afterwards that he found the Archbishop, whom he knew before to be a nimble disputant, to be as well versed in books as in business :—that he had been ferreted by him from one hole to another, till there was none left to afford him shelter any where—that he was now resolved to be orthodox, and to declare himself a true son of the Church, both for doctrine and discipline, —that to this end he had obtained leave to call himself his Grace's chaplain, because, by naming his lord and patron in his public prayers, the greater notice might be taken of the alteration."

From the narrative of this interesting event, in which two great and noble minds were brought into collision, we see the infallible characteristics of such minds, namely, a disdain of all dogmatism and subterfuge, a willingness to learn and receive instruction, and a candid confession of error, a yielding to the force of truth, so ably drawn forth by Laud's vigorous genius; a determination to love and revere that truth, and the Church in which it was maintained. The Archbishop offered Hales any preferment he pleased, and had this great prelate done nothing more, this was a victory of no common order, worthy of the governor of the Church of England, worthy of the primate of that Church which has been, and which every one will fervently pray, ever may be, the great bulwark of the Protestant Reformation, the strength and the protec-

tion, under Heaven, of every Reformed Church in Christendom. But Hales' conversion has been impugned by malice, and the memory of him who was justly called the "Ever Memorable," has been branded by false reproaches: he has been charged with having respect to the lucre of the world, and an eye to high preferment. It has been asserted, that he was gained by such motives. "This," says the learned writer, in the Scottish Episcopal Magazine, "would indeed render the acquisition of little value. The Dissenters are, notwithstanding, eager to claim him as their own, and as he certainly was theirs in principle, previous to his conference with Laud, did we suspect the slightest ground for the insinuation, which we have mentioned, theirs he should remain, in full property, with our most cordial consent. But the accusation is utterly groundless, for he suffered, not long after, the severest privations, and he suffered as a willing confessor for the cause of that Church which at one period he despised and disregarded. Penwarden, who succeeded him in Eton, being afterwards troubled in conscience for the wrong he had done so worthy a person by eating his bread, made Hales a voluntary tender of it again; but he utterly refused to be restored by the authority of what he considered a rebellious Parliament. He was reduced, in fact, to a state approaching to absolute beggary. Yet he never repined; and he died a true and suffering son of the Church, in 1656, as steady and true in its fallen and persecuted state as in possession of that prefer-

ment which was, with equal meanness and falsehood, pretended to be the price of his conversion [1]."

[1] As a confirmation of this passage, (Scottish Episcopal Magazine, vol. iii. p. 493, 494. from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Walker, of St. John's College, Cambridge, Senior Minister of St. Peter's Chapel, Edinburgh, and Professor of Divinity in the Scottish Episcopal Church,) though any thing coming from such a quarter requires no other proof, I beg leave to state the simple facts. The Archbishop pressed preferment upon Hales, whom he made his chaplain, which he modestly declined: nevertheless, a canonry of Windsor was urged upon him in such a manner, that he could not decline it without offending his munificent patron. This fact is proved by a passage in a note, p. 236, of vol. vii. of the General Dictionary, to the following effect: "As to Mr. Hales being discontented, he was so far from it, that he would willingly have waved the canonry of Windsor, when it was sent to him, knowing nothing of it from Archbishop Laud, and he would have refused it, but it was presented to him at a public dinner, among many friends, who persuaded him to the contrary. Archbishop Laud did also send for him, and told him he might have what preferment he pleased, and he answered, 'If it please your Grace, I have what I desire.' Hales enjoyed this prebend little more than two years; he was installed June 27, 1639, and was deprived at the beginning of the Civil War in 1642, when his tract on Schism was reprinted without his consent, it being thought to favour the sectarian rebels. A little before the Archbishop's death, he retired from his college to a private apartment at Eton, where he lived retired and unknown, and in such poverty, that for three months he spent only sixpence a week, living upon bread and beer: and, as he had formerly fasted from Tuesday to Thursday night, he lived then only on bread and water. When he heard of the Archbishop's murder, he burst into tears, and wished that his own head had been taken off to save that great and good prelate from his misfortunes. He was ejected from his Fellowship at Eton for not swearing to the Engagement, as it was termed, an impious oath,

About this period, Archbishop Laud was particularly active in repressing Socinian books, and

enacted in 1648-9, requiring the person solemnly to declare that he would be faithful to the Commonwealth. Steady in his loyal principles, when a compliance with the iniquity of the times would have placed him in affluence, Hales retired to the house of a lady near Eton, named Salter, sister to Dr. Duppa, Bishop of Salisbury, from whom he accepted a small salary, and his commons free, for instructing her son. Here he officiated as chaplain, with Dr. Henry King, the ejected Bishop of Chichester and others, faithfully performing the service according to the Liturgy of the Church of England. He was compelled, however, to abandon this retirement by the rigor of the rebels, and he took refuge in the house of a woman whose husband had formerly been his servant. Reduced now to want and poverty, he was forced to sell his valuable library, for a part of which he received from a London bookseller 700*l.*; yet such was his generosity, that he shared this money with suffering clergymen and scholars. He died, like a Christian and a philosopher, on the 19th of May, 1656, in the 72d year of his age, in this humble retreat, and was buried in the church-yard of Eton, where a monument was erected to his memory." "It is not one of the least ignominies of that age," says Andrew Marvell, (in his Rehearsal Transported, p. 175, 8vo. edit.) "that so eminent a person should have been, by the iniquities of the times, reduced to those necessities under which he lived." The posthumous Works of Hales are, 1. His "Golden Remains," published in 1659, 4to. and in 1673, with numerous additions, and also in 1688. 2. "Four Sermons," published in 1673. 3. In 1677, appeared in 8vo. "Several Tracts by the Ever Memorable John Hales, of Eton College." For accounts of this great man, see Bishop Pearson, apud "Golden Remains." Wood, Athen. Oxon. vols. i. and ii. Heylin's Life of Laud. Bates' "Vitæ aliquot Sectorum," printed in 1613, and 1681. 4to. General Dictionary, vols. v. and viii. Des Maiseaux's Account of Hales' Life and Writings. Limborch, apud "Præstantium ac Eruditorum Vi-

" it is remarkable," observes the noble historian, " that the canons of 1640, which were imputed to the Primate as a heinous crime, contain more declarations against Socinianism than were ever made by any other Church." This Lord Clarendon has fully proved, in his " Animadversions upon Mr. Cressy's book, entitled, Fanaticism fanatically imputed to the Catholic Church, by Dr. Stillingfleet, and the imputation refuted and retorted," published in 1672. And as it was of the utmost importance in that age of licentious and seditious enthusiasm, to exercise a vigilant care over the press, which had often become the engine of blasphemy, fanaticism, and seditious libel, the Archbishop was resolved to enforce that decree which he had procured on July 1, 1637, respecting printing and the abuses of the press, which enacted that no work should hereafter be published unless duly licensed by the competent authorities. This restriction, not only salutary, but in that age highly necessary, though it did not at once restrain the cunning practices of the malecontents, tended at least to counteract and correct that daring spirit which they had often mani-

rorum Epistolæ Eccles. et Theolog." folio, 1684. Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy. Bishop Stillingfleet, in his Irenicum, Preface to Remarks on Eccles. Hist. vol. i. Heylin's Quinquarticular History. Echard's History of England, vol. i. Marvell's Rehearsal Transported. Le Neve's Monumenta Anglicana, 8vo. 1718. Sir John Suckling's Fragmenta Aurea, 1658. Rowe's Life of Shakspeare. Dr. Thomas Smith in his Account of the Greek Church. Fuller's Worthies of England, &c. &c.

fested, and for which some of their leaders were deservedly though severely punished.

Holland, however, was the great resort of the Puritan faction. Finding every thing so congenial to their wishes in that country—Calvinism openly recognised and established—a freedom from every restraint under which they laboured in England; above all, those doctrines openly taught by Von Harmen or Arminius, and defended by the learning of Grotius and Episcopius, condemned and execrated with the usual intolerance of the Calvinistic creed, the disaffected beheld that country as the most highly favoured on earth, and they seriously believed that in it, and the American province of New England, whither they affirmed the gospel had departed from the mother country, were the only regions where that gospel was professed in its purity. Holland was beloved by them, however, on another account. Thither they repaired with many of their pestilent productions, printed, and then imported them into England, to edify the faction, and insult lawful authority. In particular, that translation of the Bible called the Genevan, was industriously circulated from the United Provinces. To this translation James had manifested a peculiar antipathy, chiefly on account of the notes and expositions with which its translators thought proper to accompany it, and thus impose their own opinions as the infallible illustrations of the oracle of truth. These notes, as will be seen on a perusal of the Genevan Bible, inculcate, in language sufficiently

energetic, disobedience to princes, which is equivalent to rebellion, and even pronounced the murder of them a praiseworthy exploit, if they should be what the faction chose to conceive idolators. The most pernicious and abominable tenets of Popery were there cunningly averred and set forth by a faction, not less intolerant and arrogant in its pretensions to heaven-derived authority. According to those zealots, every sacred bond or promise was to be broken and disregarded, if it should be thought to have a tendency to hurt the gospel;—only another modification, and one not less revolting, of the Popish dogma, that no faith ought to be kept with heretics, and not very different from the jesuitical maxim, that "the end justifies the means." Episcopacy was openly attacked, the *jus divinum* of Presbytery was cunningly set forth on every occasion; the prelates were charitably designated, "the locusts of the Apocalypse," and the fanaticism of the Anabaptists was also displayed, in denouncing all men who enjoyed academical degrees. The wisdom of James had led him to prohibit the printing of these Bibles, and he resolved that the new translation should be unaccompanied by any comments or glosses, which gave great offence to the Nonconformists. Nevertheless, they were still printed in Holland, and vast quantities were imported into England. It was in this year that the Archbishop received intelligence from Sir William Boswell, ambassador at the Hague, that a large impression of the Genevan Bible, and exclusively intended for

England, had been stopped by the terror of his decree on unlawful printing; and he so effectually managed matters by means of the ambassador at the Hague, that a proclamation was issued by the States-General of the Provinces, against those who published seditious and libellous books against the Church of England, and the government of the kingdom.

Concerning the province of New England, whither many of the enthusiasts betook themselves, I insert only a few hasty notices. Unfortunately, the government of the mother country paid little attention to that colony, and the inhabitants made ample use of the indulgence granted them to establish any government they chose; and the settlers being generally disappointed enthusiasts, who carried with their extravagant follies the intolerance of Presbytery, the phrensy of the Anabaptists, the licentiousness of the Brownists, and the fanciful notions of the Independents, who had declared the co-operation, but not the subordination, of several churches, as set forth by Robinson, their apostle, and who were therefore not less hostile to Presbytery than the latter was to them; all concentrated together in one incongruous mass. Accordingly, the administration of this colony partook of all the follies and evils incidental to prejudices and wild imaginations, accompanied, nevertheless, with severe restraint. Adultery, perjury, witchcraft, blasphemy, and filial revenge, (that is, cursing and striking parents,) were all made capital crimes. Those who were

detected in falsehood, drunkenness, or *dancing*, were to receive a public castigation; but while these were strictly prohibited and punished as crimes, they contrived to sanction indulgences, and a person might indulge in swearing by paying a fine of $11\frac{3}{4}d.$ per oath; break the Sabbath for $2l.$ $19s.$ $9\frac{3}{4}d.$; prayer might also be neglected upon the payment of a fine. They most absurdly enacted laws against the worship of images, though they were all violent zealots against Popery, which was punishable by death; and the same punishment was to be awarded to Roman Catholic priests, who, being banished from the colony should presume to return. In later times, those sectaries were almost equally hostile towards the Quakers, who, if they returned after banishment, were to be whipped, branded, and expelled; and he who was so bold as to hold any communication with them, was to be punished by an enormous fine.

This was the conduct of the New England sectaries, who fled from their country, because, as they alleged, they were persecuted, and because civil and religious liberty was dearer to them than their existence. Amongst them all, however, Calvinism preponderated more or less; so true is it, that sectarianism contains the essence of intolerance; that every sect is persecuting, when it obtains the mastery, and that it rests not merely in victory, but in a resolution to "*compel* all men to believe," according as it believes. Nor does it unfrequently happen, that those very men who in a state of subjection

are the loudest declaimers for liberty of conscience become themselves, when exalted, worse than those whom they inveterately oppose. In New England, there were some, more moderate than their brethren, who ventured to deny the absolute power of the civil magistrate to punish in religious matters. These were persecuted by the *very preachers who had fled from England rather than submit to the Church;* it was considered as blasphemy, and they actually proposed a law, which exposed those who dissented from it to dreadful oppressions, to establish a general unanimity of opinion, and inflict a capital punishment on every one who should presume to think for himself. The reader will find, in the famous work of Thomas Edwards, himself a Presbyterian minister, entitled "Gangræna," the First Part of which was published in 4to, at London, 1645, the Second and Third Parts in 1646, a most lamentable catalogue of blasphemies, follies, and extravagances of the sectaries, in which are set forth, as the *imprimatur* to the First Part rightly observes, "the mischief of ecclesiastical anarchy, the monstrousness of much affected toleration." It is observed by Dr. Heylin, that, from the notorious anarchy and fanaticism which prevailed in New England, that colony being "a constant receptacle of discontented, dangerous, and schismatical persons," drawing to it "many sad, sullen, and offensive humours," it was proposed this year to send a bishop for their "better government, and to back him with some forces to compel, if he were not other-

wise able to persuade obedience." If this were the case, though it might have been desirable, it was not surely at that time expedient. No other notice is given of such a design, though Heylin's authority, considering that he lived at the time, and was intimate with Laud and other prelates, is not to be disregarded. Many plans, doubtless, were frustrated by those melancholy disasters which the Scottish Covenanters occasioned.

In the month of June this year, we find the Archbishop, as Chancellor of the University of Oxford, making a visitation of Merton College, which he adjourned to the second of October, on which date he farther considered the affairs of that College, which occupied him three days, and which he then adjourned till the 1st of July, in the ensuing year, "*inter horas primam et tertiam, Lambeth.*" Of this College the Archbishop was the immediate Visitor in right of his See. The affair which caused this particular visitation related to the practices of those who inclined to Puritanism, and not only adhered with pertinacity to their own notions, but wished to allure others to patronise their enthusiasm. The visitation in June he had made by proxy in the person of the Dean of the Arches, but he himself heard the cause in October. Yet, while his moderation was remarkable towards Sir Nathaniel Brent, his Vicar-General, and at that time Warden of the College, he experienced the base return of ingratitude from that individual, who, on

a future occasion, was unmindful of the favours he had received from his generous patron.

The Diary contains few records of private events this year, and, perhaps, towards its close, this was the only year of tranquillity in the Archbishop's life. Not that he was inattentive to affairs of state, or to the Scottish troubles, but his enemies, at this time, seem to have made a momentary cessation from their hostility, though it was destined to break out with new and disastrous fury in the ensuing year.

CHAPTER XVIII.

1638.

The Scottish Covenanters—Their practices—The Marquis of Hamilton sent to Scotland—His sentiments on the state of the kingdom—Violence of the Covenanters—Arrival of Hamilton—His treatment—The castle of Edinburgh seized—Remarkable acts of violence—Letters of Hamilton to Laud—State of Scotland—Disorders in Edinburgh—Hamilton opens his commission—Demands of the Covenanters—Hamilton returns to London—Conduct of the Covenanters during his absence—His return—Noble conduct of the Glasgow Clergy—Libels of the Covenanters against the Bishops—Remarkable instance of their profane hypocrisy—Concessions of the King—Recantation of a Jesuit—The prophetess of the Covenanters—The Glasgow Assembly—Account of its members—Their practices—Disorders of the Assembly—Its illegal acts—Is dissolved by Hamilton—Continues to sit—Treason of the Covenanters—Flight of the Scottish prelates—Death of Archbishop Spottiswoode—His character.

The year 1638 is not yet concluded. We must turn our attention to the North, and there behold those contentions which began in tumult, and ended in rebellion and blood. The fame of the Scottish Covenanters speedily spread over Europe, and France exulted in the troubles which threatened the British king. Cardinal Richelieu, by his agents, contributed much to keep alive the flame of discontentment, and the Jesuits were overjoyed at a commotion

which gave them hopes of ultimate success in re-establishing their power. Knowing well the hostility of the King and the Archbishop to the Popish religion, they had always entertained a most implacable hatred towards the Church of England; and though the Monarch and the Primate were openly branded by the opposite faction as secret Papists, the priests well knew the falseness of the charge. They scrupled, not, therefore, to join with the Puritans and Covenanters in promoting this Revolution: and the invectives published by the latter against their sovereign, were cordially approved of by the Romish emissaries. In England, they found the Puritan faction alive to the interests of the Scottish insurgents: the ship-money and the prosecutions in the Star-Chamber were maintained to be grievous and tyrannical; those who had been disobliged, or who had imagined themselves disobliged, by the government or the Church, joined in the universal clamour, and studiously endeavoured to fan that flame which had been excited by the stern enthusiasts of the North.

Without entering into very minute details of those practices which were adopted after the Covenant had been sworn at Edinburgh, it may be proper to observe, that nothing, after the adoption of this measure, was farther from the intention of the Covenanters than to agree to any terms of reconciliation. The fanatical combination had become so general, especially in the Lowlands, (which comprehend all the counties south of the river Tay, and

the Ochil Mountains north of the Forth, which extend from the Tay, till they communicate with the stupendous ridge of the Grampians,) and, withal, so violent, aided by the public declamations of the preaching zealots, that the King became alarmed at the threatening aspect. Charles, though he had received ample provocation, was still peaceably inclined; a secret attachment towards his native kingdom yet remained, and this regard prompted him to propose terms of accommodation, rather than to shed the blood of his subjects and his countrymen. The guilt, then, the moral guilt of the rebellion, rests with the Covenanters. The King was the last to take up arms; nor did he do so until his crown was threatened, and his honour insulted by illiterate and seditious enthusiasts.

The Marquis of Hamilton was appointed by the King his commissioner in Scotland, and vested with ample powers to treat with the Covenanters. It is not my intention here to discuss the opinions of different writers concerning the conduct of that nobleman. His sincerity has been disputed, and he has been branded as a secret friend to the rebels. Whatever were his principles, one thing, at least, is certain, that the Covenanters viewed him as an enemy; and his melancholy fate ought certainly to vindicate him from the charge of having secretly cherished that enthusiasm which he was dispatched to allay. Although attached to the King, he was not publicly connected with either party. His father had promoted the Articles of Perth, and he him-

self had remained firm in his loyalty to the throne. After his return from the continent, he had taken no part in the distractions of his country, and when he was nominated to the arduous mission, though he conceived it his duty to comply, he candidly informed the King that success was hopeless, and the employment pregnant with danger. His life and fortune, he said, were at his sovereign's disposal, and these he would never hesitate to hazard for his service; but he was totally unacquainted with the Scottish leaders, and he could not but foresee that it would endanger that, which, next his salvation, he valued most, the continuance of his sovereign's favour[1].

Yet I am inclined to think, that Hamilton did not act with that decision of mind which he was called upon to exercise, neither do I think that his jealousy of the Marquis of Montrose is at all justifiable. If the venerable Bishop Guthrie of Moray is to be credited, his conduct was indeed most blameable; and it may, perhaps, be asserted, that he first gave cause to Montrose to suspect his motives. I am not disposed to set aside the testimony of that excellent and truly pious prelate. Montrose was at this time a rigid Covenanter, he had unrestrained intercourse with the chiefs of that party; and, when he returned to his loyalty, he might have publicly proclaimed the infamous designs which the faction had long contemplated.

[1] Burnet's Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, p. 38.

On the 26th of May, 1638, as the Archbishop has recorded in his Diary, to which he has added a pious prayer, the Marquis left the Court for Scotland. His instructions are inserted at large in Bishop Burnet's Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton. On the 4th of June he arrived at the neutral town of Berwick, where he was met by the Earls of Roxburgh, Lauderdale, and Lord Lindsay, who informed him of the demands of the Covenanters. He did not, however, think it prudent so soon to propose any terms: and he was anxious to proceed that he might open his commission. No sooner had the Covenanters heard of Hamilton's approach, than, suspecting that there would be proposals for an accommodation, their preachers declaimed against him. It was publicly declared that his arrival betokened no good; sermons were delivered in opposition to his supposed intentions: they charged the King with treachery, and warned the people to refuse every treaty, as a snare laid for their destruction. It was a plan, they said, of the English Archbishop, still farther to subvert their religion, as the introduction of Popery, according to them, was the aim of that prelate: this senseless notion was accompanied with every denunciation of terror which their ingenuity could devise, to deter the people from attempting any thing contrary to the approbation of the whole faction; they were told, that if they submitted they would be perjured traitors, betrayers of Jesus Christ, and the true religion: their souls' salvation, they impiously de-

clared, was at stake; and, lest the pulpits should not be sufficient for these exhortations, seditious addresses and resolutions were circulated throughout the kingdom with incredible dispatch. New committees were appointed, and, to complete their treasonable objects, measures were taken to procure a supply of arms.

An incident occurred at this time, which farther excited their sedition. The Castle of Edinburgh, built on an almost inaccessible rock at the west of the city, and on the summit of the ridge on which the old city is built, impregnable on every side except the east, where the entrance is defended by various batteries, was at this time the most important fortress in the kingdom, commanding the city and the adjoining country, as Dunbarton commands the river Clyde, and Stirling the entrance to the Northern Highlands. In this fortress there is always a considerable supply of arms, and to the possession of it the Covenanters turned their wistful eyes. At this juncture a vessel arrived in the roadstead of Leith, in the estuary of the Forth, which the Castle overlooks and commands, having on board arms and ammunition for the garrison. The rage of the Covenanters was immediately excited; although two hundred muskets, as many pikes, and a small quantity of powder, were all the military stores on board, the zealots quadrupled the number; and they resolved to seize the vessel next day, which they could easily have done, as it was not a ship of war. But the Earl of Traquair, aware of their

intentions, commanded the military stores to be conveyed to land in boats during the night, and disembarking them at Fisherrow, a village about six miles from the sea-port of Leith, he conveyed them to Dalkeith, the castle of which belonged to the King. When the Covenanters discovered their disappointment next day, their rage amounted to fury. It was proposed that they should march to Dalkeith, and seize the military stores by force,—a motion which was overruled by the more moderate. Nevertheless, to prevent the supplies from reaching the garrison, they stationed guards around it, and at all the gates of the city. And they scrupled not to publish abroad, that these stores were intentionally ordered to Dalkeith by the Marquis, and that he designed to invite them thither to a conference, and there dispatch them by a gunpowder explosion[1].

With the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Marquis preserved a continual correspondence; and we have the authority of Burnet for saying, that "whatever that prelate might have done formerly in Scottish affairs, being abused by persons who did not truly represent them to him, *he was a good instrument this year*, which appears from his letters to the Marquis, with the copies of his returns, which are extant." When Hamilton arrived in Scotland, he found the country in rebellion. Sixty thousand insurgents had assembled at Edinburgh; the

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, p. 52.

preaching zealots had prohibited any from waiting upon him. The dangers with which he was beset were numerous and threatening. Many of the nobles openly favoured the Covenant; and Sir Thomas Hope, the King's Advocate, a zealot for the cause, was one of his greatest obstacles. That lawyer defeated him by points of law to which the Marquis was a stranger, and not one of the lawyers could he get to declare that the Covenant was treasonable. Perceiving, before he left Berwick, that treating with those enthusiasts would be of no avail, he dispatched a messenger to the King, to prepare him for violent measures, and advised him to send off expresses to the Continent to prevent the purchase of arms by the emissaries of the Covenant.

Fifteen hundred men guarded the gates of the metropolis, and the magistrates had been deprived of the keys of the city by the chiefs of the *Tables;* the Castle was also secured, at least possession of it would have been easy if the insurgents had been inclined, from the want of ammunition; but they contented themselves with setting vigilant guards at the gates, by which it was rendered useless: moreover, it was publicly threatened by the zealots, that they would compel the Marquis, the Council, and the Session to subscribe the Covenant. Hamilton approached Dalkeith, six miles south from the metropolis, almost as a private individual; and reckoning it unsafe to proceed farther, he there took up his residence. He called a council, to whom his commission was read and registered. Deputies arrived

from Edinburgh, entreating him to reside at the palace of Holyrood-house, which he refused to do, unless those deputies became bound for the peace of the citizens, and unless the guards at the gates, and before the Castle, were dismissed. This being agreed to, he left Dalkeith to reach the metropolis by the coast. Proceeding by the beautiful village of Inveresk, he entered the town of Musselburgh, about four miles from Dalkeith, and six by the coast from the city, attended by the Lords of the Privy Council, and such of the nobles and gentlemen as were devoted to their sovereign. No sooner, however, had Hamilton entered Musselburgh, in his progress towards the capital, than he found 60,000 enthusiasts assembled to meet him, on the common termed the Links, adjoining the shore, (the curvature of which forms Musselburgh Bay), headed by the whole of their leaders, and by numbers of their preachers, who rejoiced at this ostentatious display of their power. Four of the most zealous fanatics had resolved to edify him with speeches, and one, in particular, wished to disburden his mind[1]. But Hamilton knew well the nature of their harangues, and declined the compliment. Attended by this tumultuous assemblage, he was conducted to the palace, amidst loud exe-

[1] "We had appointed Mr. William Livingstone, the strongest in voice and austerest in countenance, to make him a SHORT welcome." Baillie, vol. i. p. 61.

crations against Popery, Bishops, and the Book of Common Prayer[1].

Hamilton now opened his commission. He required to know from the Covenanters the extent of their demands, and what the King might consider as an evidence of their return to obedience, which he said could only be done by first renouncing the Covenant. To this it was answered, that nothing would satisfy them but a General Assembly and a free Parliament; they absurdly denied that they had ever departed from their allegiance; they declared they would as soon renounce their baptism as abate one syllable of the Covenant; that they esteemed it more useful and available than all the laws enacted since the reign of Fergus their first king, and they invited the Marquis himself to subscribe it, informing him "with what peace and comfort it had filled the minds of all God's people; what resolutions and beginnings of reformation of manners were insensibly perceived in all parts of the nation, above any measures they had ever before found, or could have expected; how great glory the Lord had received thereby, and their confidence that God would make Scotland a blessed kingdom[2]." And to complete their hypocrisy, they gave notice to the Marquis, that if the English Liturgy, used for

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, p. 54. Large Declaration, p. 85, 86. Bishop Guthrie, p. 33.

[2] Large Declaration, p. 88.

twenty years in the chapel-royal, was read there on the ensuing Sunday, the officiating clergyman would never read it more.

To treat with such enthusiasts was utterly hopeless, nay, residence among them was dangerous. In this posture of affairs the Marquis wrote to the King and Archbishop Laud. The King expressed his grief that the insurgents had possessed themselves of Edinburgh Castle, and he had little hopes of Stirling. He instructed him to possess himself, if possible, of these two fortresses, and not to consent to a General Assembly or Parliament till the Covenant was given up. "Your chief end," said he, "is to win time, that they may not commit public follies until I be ready to suppress them. When I consider that not only my crown, but my reputation for ever lies at stake, I must rather suffer the first, which time may help, than this last, which is irreparable. This I have written for no other end than to shew you I will rather die than yield to those impertinent and damnable demands, as you rightly call them." In a postscript, the King advises the Marquis, not to declare the Covenanters traitors until he should receive notice that his fleet had sailed for Scotland [1].

In his letters to Archbishop Laud, the Marquis gave the Primate a statement of the situation in which he was placed. The King had resolved on force, if no other expedients would avail, and he

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, p. 55. Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 752.

entreated the Archbishop to bestow his attention on Scottish affairs. He had resolved not to declare the Covenant for the present a traitorous bond, he said to the Archbishop, for the hazard would be a complete rupture, and the ruin of the King's friends; whereas, on the other hand, if there were any hazard, it would risk his own head, which he was willing at any time to lose for the King's service. The Covenanters, in the mean time, on learning that the Covenant must be disavowed, or there could be no treaty, were furious in their declamations; they declared that *faggots were prepared for the Marquis in hell,* and that they would not resign the Covenant but with their lives [1].

The demands for a General Assembly and a Parliament increased, and as Hamilton had no power to grant these, he obtained permission from the King to return to London. On the 6th of July he departed, informing the Covenanters that he would endeavour to procure them, promising that he would return by the end of August, and in the mean time obtaining from them a promise, that they would preserve the public peace till the expiration of that period. When he arrived at Greenwich, he laid before the King the real state of affairs; and he suggested that the renewal of the confession of faith subscribed at the Reformation, and afterwards by his royal father, might be a means of weakening the faction; and he proposed to the King whether it would not be pru-

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, p. 56.

dent, at the present crisis, to comply in some degree with their demands. This was sanctioned, the Covenant of 1580 was renewed, larger concessions were made, and, armed with more extensive powers, the Marquis returned to Scotland on the 9th day of August.

But during his absence, though they had made no public breach of the peace, the zealots were not idle. Their preachers from the pulpit were busy in propagating their enthusiasm, which they daringly identified with religion, and studiously promoting their influence over the people. They aimed at much greater concessions than they had formerly presumed to anticipate; and nothing now would serve them but the total abolition of the Episcopal Church; the establishment of their intolerant and seditious assemblies, and a public acknowledgment that their Presbyterianism was the only form of church government warranted by the Scriptures. And, in fine, they did not scruple to publish that the Marquis had himself sanctioned the Covenant, or at least approved of it, in the manner they had presented it to him; which falsehood had a wonderful effect on the people in their itinerating journies through the Lowland counties to procure additional subscriptions [1].

Hamilton accordingly found that the demands of the faction had exorbitantly increased during his absence. They rejected with disdain his proposals to

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, p. 68. Large Declaration, p. 111, 112, &c. Whitelocke's Memorials, p. 28.

call a General Assembly and Parliament, and threatened, if he would not listen to their proposals, they would themselves call these by their own authority. He undertook another journey to court, having obtained a farther promise from the insurgents that nothing should be done till his return, which he declared should be before the 20th of September. About the end of August, the Marquis proceeded to England, and on his way he stopped at Broxmouth, in Roxburghshire, to consult with the Earls of Roxburgh, Traquair, and Southesk. Here certain articles were agreed to and drawn up, to be presented to the King. They proposed to revoke the Book of Canons and the Liturgy; that the Court of High Commission should be abolished; that the Five Articles of Perth should be cancelled; that the confession against Popery and the bond annexed to it, passed in the reign of James, should be subscribed; that a free pardon and act of oblivion should be passed for all late offences; and they concluded with stating, that, if his Majesty would ratify these, "should any be so foolish or mad still to disturb the peace of his Majesty's government, they [Hamilton, Traquair, Roxburgh, and Southesk] humbly made offer of their lives and fortunes to assist his Majesty or his Commissioner in suppressing all insolencies and insolent persons [1]."

It is impossible to peruse the account of the proceedings of Hamilton without expressing disappro-

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, p. 70, 71.

bation. I am far from insinuating that he was treacherous to his sovereign, for it appears to me that Bishop Burnet has established the loyalty of this unfortunate nobleman in the most satisfactory manner. When we consider that the King's letters to him evinced the confidence of the monarch, and that those of Archbishop Laud also commended his prudence, "in the active part in the commixture of wisdom and patience[1]," it cannot be doubted for a moment that he acted according to the best intentions, hoping to serve his sovereign in the most effectual manner. Yet, making every allowance for the unhappy circumstances in which he was placed, the faction opposed to him, and the fearful fanaticism by which he was every where surrounded, it cannot be denied, that this temporizing policy was obviously calculated to enable the discontented zealots to strengthen themselves, this timidity the means to increase their seditious insolence. These delays were imputed by them to fear, and therefore they became the more emboldened; and the first concessions of the King encouraged them to more unreasonable demands. They had no right to overthrow the Church, or to petition for its overthrow; because the Church had been established and ratified by the states of the kingdom. But though they had all sworn obedience to their several bishops, they scrupled not to perjure themselves, on the tenets which they assumed, that no oaths were bind-

[1] Letters apud Burnet's Memoirs, p. 108—110.

ing which *they* conceived contrary to the gospel. If, however, that compound of sedition, fanaticism, and prejudice, which every discontented zealot chooses to utter, is to be called the gospel, the order of government is defeated, confusion and rebellion inevitably follow. But I cannot help coinciding with the sentiments of Heylin, which he has somewhere expressed, however much they may be reprobated by some, that " if the King had backed his original proclamation to the Scots with a powerful army, according to the custom of his predecessors, kings of England, it might have done some good among them. But proclamations of grace and favour, if not backed by arms, are like cannons charged with powder, without bullets, making more noise than execution, and they serve no other purpose than to make the rebels insolent and the prince contemptible."

The Marquis proceeded to court, and the King sanctioned these articles, not without great reluctance. In truth, Charles must have known that this was virtually authorizing the sedition of the zealots, and creating in their minds a greater contempt for his authority. The Marquis hastened back to Scotland, and arrived at the palace of Holyrood-house, three days before he was expected. In his progress, he met with those Scottish prelates who had taken refuge in England from the fanatical rage of the Covenanters. Thus were all the Scottish bishops forced into exile, with the exception of four, Ramsay of Dunkeld, Fairley of Argyle, and Graham

of Orkney, who, to their disgrace signed a recantation to the Covenanters, and the venerable Bishop Guthrie of Moray, who would not purchase his ease at so dear a rate. He would neither flee nor recant, but remained nobly enduring insults, sufferings, privations, imprisonment, excommunication, and every indignity, asserting the divine authority of Episcopacy till his death. The exiled prelates, on learning from Hamilton that he was authorized to call an Assembly to which they were to be amenable, besought him to reflect on this dangerous measure, on the mischief which would arise to Church and State from this injudicious conduct; and entreated him to suspend his proceedings till one of them should represent the case completely to the King. Notwithstanding their warm remonstrances, the Commissioner proceeded on his journey. After his arrival, he made known by proclamations the King's intentions, hoping to allay the public ferment. He cancelled the Book of Canons, discharged the Liturgy, and the High Commission, revoked the Five Articles of Perth, and the acts for their establishment, appointed a General Assembly to meet at Glasgow on the 21st of November, and summoned a Parliament to meet in the following May, 1639.

Yet it will hardly be believed, for certainly the case has few parallels, that all these acts of the King were treated with the most supercilious disdain by the haughty fanatics. Wherever the royal proclamations were published, they were encountered by protests, and by the most cunning attempts to

misinterpret their meaning, and render them of no effect. This opposition was manifested under the veil of the most hypocritical sanctity. The clergy of Glasgow, in their letter to the Commissioner, thanking his Majesty for the appointment of the Assembly, termed the King "their crown of rejoicing, and the breath of their nostrils." To do them justice, the clergy of that city were peculiarly moderate, and the whining, groaning rhetoric of Cant, who preached the Covenant among them, had not been remarkably successful. But the interested and hot-headed leaders, both among the preachers and the laity, easily perceived that they would gain nothing without an illegal election; and they accordingly proceeded to order it in such a manner, that none but the most rigid of the faction should be chosen. This was what those men pretended would constitute a *free* General Assembly. The reader will observe, that, though the acts for Scottish Episcopacy had never been repealed, yet the craftiness of Andrew Melville had provided that the members of the General Assembly should consist of an almost equal number of clergy and laymen. But when James, after assuming the reins of government, wished to establish the Protestant Episcopal Church, not only on the basis of the old acts of Parliament, which had ratified Episcopacy from the time of the Culdees, but also on such a basis as he hoped would render that Church, as it had already become, national, he deprived the laymen of their seats in the ecclesiastical court, not only because he

dreaded their violent enthusiasm in exciting commotions, but also because it was a practice unparalleled that laymen should legislate for the Church in matters of doctrine; and, moreover, the Church could not become essentially Episcopal and primitive, while laymen, who generally were then sufficiently ignorant, constituted a part of the ecclesiastical court. The leaders of the Covenanters, however, thought proper to assume to themselves a sovereign power, and the *Tables* restored these unprecedented proceedings. They commanded that a lay elder from every parish should attend the minister, and give his vote for the election of a minister to the Assembly. Now, as the ministers who were nominated could not themselves vote, and as the number of ministers and elders was equal, it followed that the whole election fell into the hands of the lay-voters. Then, again, the sages of the *Tables* adopted another expedient, which, in effect, proves that election by the unrestrained suffrages of the people at large, (to speak plainly, popular election,) seldom answers the purpose. They contrived, I say, to render even this election a mere farce, by their nominating all the members themselves; and in private, they ordered that every elder should be bound by an oath not to vote for any member who had not been previously approved by the *Tables*. And if, after all these devices, any one should be nominated whom they chose to consider *malignant*, they had a plan prepared to rid themselves of him, by preferring a libel against him to the Assembly, no matter

whether true, false, or even probable, and thus the person accused could not demand a vote till his alleged accusation was declared groundless[1].

As the bishops were the objects of their implacable hatred, the zealots dispatched them in a summary manner. I have said that they never inquired whether the libels were true or false; accordingly, the two Archbishops, and all the Bishops of Scotland, were accused and libelled, individually, as guilty of "excessive drinking, whoring, gaming, profanation of the Sabbath; contempt of public ordinances and family worship; mocking at prayer, preaching, and spiritual conference; also, of bribery, simony, dishonesty, perjury, oppression, *adultery*, and *incest*[2]*!!*" and that this *very modest* libel might have

[1] Large Declaration, p. 189. 191. 207. 218. 225. 283.

[2] As a farther instance of the dispositions of those men who opposed their King, and overthrew the Church, Samuel Rutherford, one of their greatest saints, whose writings, as I have observed, are a compound of blasphemy, hypocrisy, obscenity, falsehood, calumny, and nonsense, had the presumption and villainy to accuse Archbishop Spottiswood of St. Andrew's, the most learned, virtuous, and pious prelate that ever adorned the primacy of Scotland, or perhaps of any Church—this venerable prelate, I say, is actually accused by that fanatic of incest with his own daughter. See Rutherford's Lex Rex, preface, p. 6, published at London, 4to. 1644. Yet it is a remarkable fact, that this Presbyterian saint, who is yet canonized by the zealots, and whose "Letters" contain the most disgusting and blasphemous ribaldry which can be conceived, was himself not remarkably chaste, nor free from licentiousness; for he was compelled to resign an office he held in the University of Edinburgh, in the year 1625, for "*some scandal on account of his marriage.*"—Crawford's History of the University of Edinburgh.

greater publicity, it was ordered to be read from all the pulpits in Edinburgh, immediately after the celebration of the holy eucharist, which these impious zealots dared to profane by this indulgence of their furious passions; nay, on account of the time occupied in the celebration of the Communion, and the lateness of the day, they actually omitted the thanksgivings and prayers that they might publish this atrocious libel; adding, that whoever subscribed the King's covenant and confession were perjured villains. Yet it is remarkable, that when the Assembly was held, and the prelates summoned, so conscious were the Covenanters of the falsehood and malignancy of the charge, and of the infamy which induced it, that they made not the slightest attempt to prove a libel, which was in reality an awful mockery of, and insult to, religion, to its authorized ministers, and to common sense.

Although it might have been expected that the royal concessions would have appeased the insurgents, and although the moderate party among them was fully satisfied of the fairness of the King's intentions, this was not the case with the violent leaders, who began to be equally unsparing in their abuse of their less violent brethren. It was declared from the pulpit that the Covenant was infallible, and that "it was approved from Heaven by rare and undeniable signs." The King's confession was termed the "the depth and policy of Satan." Their influence, too, increased. Lord Lorne, or rather the Earl of Argyle, who afterwards received

the reward of his rebellion and treachery, by this time a zealot for Presbytery, had engaged all his feudal dependents in the cause, and the ignorant Highlanders of the counties in which his influence prevailed, were ready to unsheath the sword at the command of their superior. This, however, though an accession of strength to the cause, was no accession of popularity: for those feudal dependents, as is well known, were ever ready to follow their chieftain, in whatever contention he engaged. But, that no device might be omitted to further the Covenant, the zealots scrupled not to call in other aids, which sufficiently indicate their dispositions and designs.

The first was the conversion of a person named Abernethy, who from a Jesuit became a violent Presbyterian; thus giving some proofs that the opinions of Lysimachus Nicanor, in the "Epistle Congratulatorie," were not altogether void of foundation. "This man," says Bishop Burnet, "had learned as much of falsehood in the Jesuits' school, as to forge a story of the Liturgy of Scotland being sent to Rome to some Cardinals, to be revised by them, and that Con had shewed it to him there. Upon the report of this, Hamilton wrote to Con, who was then in London; but Con protested solemnly he never so much as heard of a Liturgy designed for Scotland till he came last to England, and that he had only once seen Abernethy at Rome, but finding him light-headed, he took no farther notice of him. Yet Abernethy's story had a ready belief, as well as

a welcome hearing, though the lightness and weakness of the man became afterwards so visible, that small account was made either of him or his story, which at this time took wonderfully[1]."

But the most singular contrivance of the Covenanters, was their calling to their aid a *prophetess*. A woman named Mitchelson, a clergyman's daughter, and a zealous Covenanter, who was subject to hysterical affections, became worse from the contagion of religious enthusiasm. She soon pretended to divine inspiration, and poured forth the most blasphemous and incoherent rhapsodies. As these were accompanied by fits, and distortions of the body, the crowds of zealots who visited her were lost in fear and reverence. To the house of a zealous Covenanter she was removed, where she farther exhibited her frantic gestures. All her raptures were about the Covenant, which was her perpetual theme. It was ratified in Heaven, she said, but the King's covenant was an invention of Satan. When she spoke of the Saviour of the world, she blasphemously termed him the *Covenanted Jesus*. The Bishops were the objects of her perpetual execrations. Rollock, one of the preachers, was advised to pray for her by some spectators who suspected the imposture: but the Presbyterian said, "That he durst not; he could not speak to her, while his master, Christ, was speaking in her." At times only the prophetess delivered herself, at other times she was obstinately silent. Soon was the joy-

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, p. 83.

ful report spread abroad, and thousands of all ranks repaired to see her, as if she had been a second Messiah. Those whom the crowded apartments could not hold, clung to the walls of the house, to catch the sound of her voice. She was under the operation, it was said, of the Holy Spirit; her frantic blasphemies were heard and received as the oracles of truth, and the assembled fanatics departed, confirmed in the faith of the Covenant, and "rejoicing in hope[1]."

On the 21st of November, the Assembly convened at Glasgow, "which," says Archbishop Laud in his Diary, "made many strange acts." Its members had already assumed to themselves a power which equalled, if not exceeded, the pretensions of the Church of Rome—a Church to which, truly, we need not exclusively refer for proofs of intolerance and insufferable arrogance. A doctrine was now received, totally destructive of all government, which, though the wisdom of James had compelled them to abandon, was in reality the creed of all true Presbyterians of those days, that "the ecclesiastical power was independent of the civil." No man needs to be told of the evils which this pernicious dogma has induced; but such had been, in common with the Papists, the secret, and was now the public, belief of the Scottish Covenanters. They were particularly fond of comparing the Assembly and the

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, p. 83. King's Declaration, p. 227. Hume's History, vol. vi.

Parliament to Christ and the King; and as the former was held to be composed of the servants of the greater master, they boldly asserted their independence of, and sometimes their superiority over, the latter. This is publicly set forth by Samuel Rutherford, in that production of his entitled "Lex Rex," where, after abusing Maxwell, Bishop of Dunblane, for denying "that the crown and sceptre are under any co-active power of Pope or Presbytery," the political fanatic stoutly maintains, "that Presbyteries hold kings to be under the co-active power of Christ's keys of discipline, and that prophets and pastors, as ambassadors of Christ, have the keys of the kingdom of God, to open and admit believing princes, and also to shut them out, if they rebel against Christ; for," quoth he, "the law of Christ excepteth none, if the king's sins be remitted in a ministerial way[1]." These pernicious tenets, which the Covenanters insolently maintained from first to last, in all the stages of their rebellion, both before and after the Restoration, to say the least, equalled those pretensions by which the Roman Pontiffs had for centuries distinguished themselves. Yet these men, we are told, struggled for liberty; they were the patriots of their country, saints and martyrs! But the tyranny of numbers of fanatical zealots, who could unblushingly assert that Presbyteries have power to open the gates of heaven to believing princes, and also to shut them

[1] Lex Rex, preface, p. 3.

out, is most impious. Here was indeed a despotism, pretended, too, to be sanctioned by the Holy Scriptures. It can hardly be denied, that, in all the annals of the Church, there is no instance of the Popes arrogating to themselves greater power than that assumed by the Presbyterians of Scotland.

A vast multitude resorted to Glasgow, where many of the seditious nobility and gentry appeared in the capacity of elders and assessors. There were about 260 commissioners and assessors; for every presbytery from two to four and upwards, who pretended to give no vote, but only to give assistance by their advice. We may form a notion of the character of this tumultuous rabble, who were to judge of heresy, and what they chose to term Arminianism, from an observation of Bishop Burnet, "that many of them could *neither read nor write*, but depended solely on the leaders who legislated for them[1]." Many of the lay-elders also came armed with swords and daggers. A sermon was preached at the opening, in which the usual fulminations were uttered against Episcopacy, and which sufficiently indicated the spirit in which they intended to conduct their proceedings. Let it be recollected, too, that this Assembly was composed of men who had already predetermined the causes; who had *pledged themselves* to abolish Episcopacy. The issue of it could not fail to be anticipated, and perhaps we may date the beginning of the King's

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, p. 98.

misfortunes from the moment that he consented to call this tumultuous rabble of enthusiasts. Certain it is, that from that day forward he encountered a series of disasters.

It might have been expected that the Covenanters would have paid some little attention to forms of law, since they were conscious of possessing not only the influence, but the unrivalled authority and the unanimous suffrages of their assembly. It was, however, quite otherwise; they proceeded in the most daring manner against all rules of decorum. Moderation formed no part of their creed: they desired not to pursue truth but victory, which they were resolved to obtain at every hazard. The first day was spent in matters of form, such as receiving the members; but even then they were engaged in cabals, and openly threatened to seize the person of the King's commissioner. The King had nominated six lords of the Privy Council as assessors to the Marquis, but the zealots positively refused to admit them, declaring, that if the King himself were present he would have but one vote, and that not a negative. In a long speech, Hamilton exhorted them to peace and moderation; but his advice was in vain. On the second day their temper became apparent. After hearing the King's letter read, the commission desired that they would also hear the protest and declaration of the Bishops. This they refused to do, till they were constituted. Henderson was chosen Moderator, and now began the tumultuous proceedings. The Marquis pro-

tested against their refusal to admit his assessors, and perceiving their disposition, he sent off a trusty messenger to the King, to advise him to prepare for war. After sitting eight days, in which the commissioner was compelled to protest against all their proceedings, he conceived that his reputation would be sacrificed were he to continue there longer. With the most unparalleled absurdity, Henderson admitted the King's power over Assemblies, and in the same breath denied it. Every motion was carried with the violence of zeal and enthusiasm. On the 28th of the month, the Marquis proceeded to their place of meeting, and in a speech in which he lamented their proceedings, he dissolved the Assembly [1].

But the zealots were prepared for this. The infamous defection and intrigues of Argyle had drawn over to their party a number of Covenanting lords, who now employed all their influence to promote the seditious meeting. Henderson replied in a speech, in which, while he acknowledged the King to be "universal bishop of all the churches in his dominions," he at the same time denied the royal prerogative in matters ecclesiastical. The Marquis made a short reply, in which he exposed their illegal conduct, and, declaring the Assembly dissolved, he proceeded to Edinburgh.

[1] Burnet's Memoirs, p. 98—105. King's Declaration, p. 239—246. Whitelocke's Memoirs, p. 29. Rushworth's Collections, vol. ii. p. 842—857.

It was not, however, the intention of the zealots to disperse; indeed, they flatly told the Marquis so, and they continued to sit by their own authority. Soon were all the acts of former Assemblies declared abrogated, since James' accession to the English throne. Episcopacy was declared abolished; the Liturgy, the Articles of Perth, the Book of Canons, were all voted antichristian; the bishops were deprived and excommunicated, and after sitting by their own authority twenty days from their legal dissolution, the Assembly rose in triumph.

It is needless farther to pursue these details. War was inevitable, and war was proclaimed; melancholy indeed is the record of future disasters. It is impossible not to feel for the unhappy situation of Charles. With the best intentions, he found himself invariably misrepresented and frustrated by zealots, nay, even betrayed by those on whom he had heaped the greatest favours. His partiality to his own countrymen was notorious, and history well testifies the base ingratitude which he experienced in return. "By the Scots about his person," remarks Heylin, "the King was so deceived and betrayed, that, as far as they could find his meaning by words, signs, and circumstances, or the silent language of a shrug, it was posted off into Scotland; nay, some of his Bed-Chamber had grown so bold and insolent, that they used to ransack his pockets while in bed, to transcribe such letters as they found, and send copies to their countrymen by the way of intelligence—a thing so well known about the court, that

the Archbishop of Canterbury, in one of his letters, gave him this memento, that he should not trust it in his pockets. For offices of trust and credit they were as well accommodated as with those of service. Hamilton, Master of the Horse, who stocked the stables with that people; the Earl of Morton, Captain of the Guard; the Earl of Ancrum, Keeper of the Privy Purse; the Duke of Lennox, Warden of the Cinque Ports, and Constable of Dover Castle; Balfour, Lieutenant of the Tower, the most important fortress in the kingdom; Wemyss, Master-Gunner of the Navy, who had the issuing of stores and all the ammunition. Look on them in the Church, and we shall find so many of that nation beneficed and preferred in all parts of the kingdom, that their ecclesiastical revenues could not but amount to more than all the yearly rents of the Kirk of Scotland; and out of these scarce one in ten who did not cordially promote and espouse their cause among the people."

It is impossible to contemplate the proceedings of this Assembly without lamenting that enthusiasm which hurries men into the most dangerous excesses. A self-constituted body to be allowed to sit and legislate in a free state in open defiance of the civil power; to rescind Acts of Parliament; to destroy the venerable establishment of religion; to arrogate to themselves the most incontrolable and heaven-derived powers; and to presume to dictate to their sovereign in whatever language they pleased;—these were proceedings destructive to the country's wel-

fare. Yet such is the feature of the Presbyterian conclave of 1638. Not only did its self-elected members set aside Acts of Parliament, but they actually restrained the liberty of the press throughout the country; they had the boldness to ordain, that no treatise should be printed within the kingdom on any controversial topic, "or any other treatise," say they, "whatsoever, which may concern the Church of Scotland or God's cause in hand," without the express licence of one of their own adherents[1]. Here was a tyranny of no common kind, though completely in the spirit of Calvinism. In all the persecutions which they falsely allege to have undergone, the King and the Bishops of Scotland never enacted such a regulation; otherwise the obscenities and blasphemies of Rutherford, Cant, Shiels, and Livingstone, would have procured for their authors that punishment which they so richly deserved.

If the private opinions of an individual or a faction are to be made the standard of government, deplorable and imbecile must be that administration; if the individual, whenever *he* thinks he is aggrieved, declares that he has a right to complain, where are justice, order, subordination? And if in religion, the fanaticism of one party is to be gratified at the expence of another, what dreadful convulsions must take place! For men will fight for their religion, when no other cause, their country, perhaps, excepted, will call them to the scene of

[1] Large Declaration, p. 323. Printed Acts of Assembly, 1638.

contention; that holy cause is identified with their early associations and their most endearing ties; their fathers, their wives and children, are all involved; for God, first, and then for their country, is the maxim of patriotic men. But how liable are even such men to perversion and to private prejudice! He who is imbued with that worst of all mental affections, fanaticism, who is attracted by novelty, who is led by designing zealots, is with one party to-day, another to-morrow. He looks with contempt on the institutions of his fathers; he says he fights for liberty, but in reality he is the dupe of rebellion. And it is beyond the possibility of a doubt, that those who clamoured violently against our constitution in Church and State, who, animated by an affected liberality, or a sectarian desire of reformation, set themselves studiously to oppose and to thwart those measures which calmness and moderation had adopted, or those establishments which the hand of time had rendered venerable and sacred, who proposed the adoption of their own visionary and untried projects, in preference to those maxims which have been respected amidst the most tremendous convulsions; those men, I say, were other than what they seemed, and while their hostility was ostensibly directed against certain institutions, they were aiming their poisonous weapons at the monarchy itself.

It is not my intention farther to comment at large on the proceedings of the Covenanters; perhaps another opportunity will be afforded me to

detail at length the secret history of this momentous era. They prepared for war; their preachers fortified their proceedings by their misinterpretations of the Holy Scriptures; they termed their war defensive, by one of their usual perversions of language; they surprised the fortress of Edinburgh Castle; the famous Leslie, who had acquired a deserved reputation in the Swedish wars, was appointed their general; Dalkeith was attacked; there they found the regalia, and an ample supply of military stores. They erected a fortification at Leith, and the very women were animated by their enthusiasm; emissaries were dispatched to London, to intrigue with the Puritan leaders; they received assistance from the French minister, Richelieu, with whom they scrupled not to carry on a treasonable correspondence; they appointed every fourth man in Scotland to bear arms; the most nefarious schemes were adopted to raise money, and were defended with unblushing effrontery from the pulpit by the champions of the Covenant; they proposed a tax on various goods, after they had drained the coffers of merchants who afterwards died beggars[1], and they would have succeeded had not the design been unpopular. Those who were suspected of loyalty, or, in their language, *malignancy*, were ordered to lend them two hundred pounds sterling, or more, according to their

[1] They contrived to obtain no less than 20,000*l.* from a merchant in Edinburgh named Dick, whose vanity they flattered by making him chief magistrate, and afterwards draining him of other sums, he died a beggar.

circumstances, and if they refused, it was doubled. On this device they valued themselves highly; it was a notable way, they said, for reaching *heart-malignants*[1].

And here let it not be forgotten, that all this was done *before* the King appeared against them with his forces; even before he had proclaimed them traitors, and the Covenant treasonable. Who, then, were the first aggressors, who the first inciters of the scourge of civil contentions? The conclusion is obvious; and, though it be granted that Charles had hitherto assumed despotic powers, which remains to be proved, the moral guilt and crime now rested on the Covenanters. The sum of the King's offence, if it may be called so, was his wish to establish a Scottish Liturgy in the Scottish Church; if he wished to impose it on them, the rebels did no less with their Covenant. But the Covenanters might have perceived, that those who opposed their Covenant were just as conscientious as themselves; the intolerance on both sides was equal, if a Liturgy is to be admitted as a grievance. But the Liturgy had this advantage over the Covenant, that while it contained a summary of Christian devotions and scriptural truth, the latter was the offspring of private hatred and disappointed ambition, abounding with impious declamations, and dreadful threatenings of damnation to those who would not subscribe.

[1] Guthrie's Memoirs, p. 42—63. Hume's History, vol. vi. p. 272. Rushworth, vol. ii. p. 840. Whitelocke, p. 28, 31—33. Lord Hailes' Memorials, vol. ii. p. 41.

The Covenanters, then, must be divested of their claims as defenders of liberty; they wished, and they attempted, to impose their Covenant on all without exception, and they excommunicated those who refused, and termed them enemies of religion. Charles did no more, but he did not excommunicate; in the King it was at the utmost, perhaps, imprudent; in the Covenanters it was the most refined intolerance and persecution.

The Bishops retreated to England, with the exceptions of Bishop Guthrie, who nobly braved the danger, and those three who ignominiously signed their recantation. Many clergymen were deposed, and fanatics appointed in their stead; the theological chairs in the Universities were purified of *malignancy*, and filled by Rutherford, Cant, and their associates, to train up a fry of violent enthusiasts. "The pulpits," says Bishop Burnet, "sounded with the ruin of religion and liberties, and that all might now look for Popery and bondage, if they did not acquit themselves like men. Curses were thundered out against those who went not out to help the angel of the Lord against the mighty, so oddly was the Scripture applied; and to set off this the better, all was carried with so many fasts and prayers. By this means it was that the poor and well-meaning people were animated into great extremities of zeal, resolving to hazard all in pursuance of the cause." In proportion as they advanced in power, and the war in violence, the unparalleled cruelties of the Covenanting leaders increased. They glutted their

eyes with the executions of *malignants,* and one fanatical Covenanting minister, after witnessing one hundred executions of *malignants,* declared, "*This wark gaes bonnilie on.*"

The venerable Archbishop Spottiswoode, now in his 73d year, retired to London. On the 27th of December, 1639, he died, worn out with grief, care, and sickness, and was buried in Westminster Abbey, where there is a monument erected to his memory. He lived not to witness the disasters of a sovereign whom he had faithfully served, nor yet the misfortunes of his own family, which his son, Sir Robert Spottiswoode, (a most worthy son of a most worthy father,) Lord President of the Court of Session, and one of the most accomplished lawyers of his age, encountered, when Covenanting fury and hatred brought him to the block at St. Andrew's, that ancient city which had long been the residence of his father. He was the most virtuous, pious, and learned primate who ever filled the metropolitan see of Scotland, and his great employments sufficiently indicate his abilities. His administration has been unjustly blamed, without considering the age in which he lived. The Covenanters traduced him, in common with the other prelates, as guilty of enormous crimes, while they themselves were licentious, obscene, and blasphemous. His great offence was, that he despised that gloomy and hypocritical sanctity which the Presbyterians so much affected, and which exposed religion to ridicule and disgrace; animated by its genuine power, in manners he was easy,

affable, and refined, pious without ostentation, and, like the metropolitan of England, who was his intimate friend, a scholar without pedantry. His literary eminence rests on a solid basis. More learned than many of his contemporaries, his History of the Church of Scotland, from the year 203 to the death of James VI. of Scotland, (published in folio, London, 1655,) has secured for him a lasting fame. Elegant in style, minute in detail, cautious in authorities, and generally exact in dates, he gives a faithful history of that Church, over which he presided with so much applause, tracing its history and revolutions with the ability of a master. Without the coarse ribaldry, low buffoonery, and indecent language of Knox, the credulity of Buchanan, the arrogance and enthusiasm of Calderwood and Kirkton, and others of the Presbyterian school, he is clear, concise, and moderate. The Covenanters heaped upon his memory the most indecent abuse; but loyalty in those wretched times was reckoned a damnable crime. His death was peaceful and affecting, and worthy of a Christian bishop. His last words were addressed to the Marquis of Hamilton, whom he conjured not to desert the King and the Church. His venerable remains were interred, at the King's command, with a solemnity due to his exalted rank, and the ancient family from which he was descended. The nobility and gentry of the kingdom, then at London, followed him to the grave. Eight hundred torches blazed during the solemn ceremony, and the Dean and Prebendaries

of Westminster celebrated his obsequies in the affecting service of the Church of England.

Such, then, is a brief history of the first melancholy fall of Scottish Episcopacy.

CHAPTER XIX.

1639—1640.

Commencement of the Civil Wars by the Scots—Order of the Privy Council to the Archbishop to raise supplies—The Earl of Traquair sent to Scotland as Commissioner—Libels against Laud—His presents to the University of Oxford—His translations of the Liturgy—He induces Bishop Hall to write the Treatise "Episcopacy by Divine Right"—Plan of the original MSS.—Observations of the Archbishop—Publication of the work—Analysis of it—Controversy it occasioned—Practices of the Puritans—Anecdote of the Archbishop—Meeting of the Parliament—Its dissolution—Indications of the Archbishop's ruin—The Convocation—It continues to sit—The Canons of 1640—Anxiety of the Archbishop—Remarks on the legality of the Convocation—Libels against the Archbishop—The mob attack Lambeth Palace, and St. Paul's—Their disorders—Practices of the Puritans—Renewed indications of his ruin—Death of Archbishop Neile—His character.

Amidst these national calamities, while the King was preparing to chastise the insolence of the Scottish Covenanters, no individual incurred greater odium than the Archbishop of Canterbury. Although the fanatics were the first aggressors,—although it had been long their intention to try their strength by arms,—although they had attended the rebellious and counterfeit Assembly at Glasgow armed with swords and daggers, and had entered into

those treasonable connexions and practices which have been already recorded,—although, in short, they had resolved to maintain the idol they had set up by an armed force,—they affected to term the war an *Episcopale Bellum*, blamed the Archbishop for all their alleged persecutions, libelled him as the chief adviser of the King for warlike preparations, while, in reality, his advice was for peace, for he had alleged, though in this he was grievously mistaken, that the controversy might be settled "by ink instead of blood."

While the King was preparing his army, an order was issued by the Privy Council, to which were prefixed the signatures of the Lord Keeper Coventry, the Lord Treasurer Juxon, the Earl of Manchester, Lord Privy Seal, the Duke of Lennox, the Lord Chamberlain Arundel, the Earls of Dorset, Pembroke, Holland, Lord Cottington, Sir Henry Vane, the Treasurer of the Household, Cooke and Windebank, the Secretaries of State, requesting the two Archbishops to write to their several suffragans, to transmit orders to the clergy of the dioceses, "to aid and assist his Majesty with their speedy and liberal contributions, and otherwise, for defence of his Royal Person and of this kingdom, against the seditious attempts of some in Scotland[1]." Accordingly, on the 31st of Jan. 1638-9, the Archbishop addressed a circular letter to all the bishops of his province, wherein he exhorted them and their clergy

[1] Heylin, p. 357. Original Col. MSS. vol. i. p. 643.

to contribute liberally towards the raising of an army, recommending to every beneficed clergyman to give at the rate of 3*s.* 10*d.* per pound of the valuation of his living or preferment in the King's books, and to remit the same to the Lord High Treasurer; and also to transmit a list of those who refused to aid the subsidy[1]. We are informed by Heylin, who took an active share in these proceedings, that the contributions were eminently successful, "even those who wished well to the Scots seeming as forward in it as any other;"—that of the Diocese of Norwich amounting to no less than 2016*l.* 16*s.* 5*d.* and of the Archdeaconry of Winchester to 1305*l.* 5*s.* 8*d.* Soon after this the King published a Declaration, in which he narrated at length the proceedings of the Covenanters, and, finally, a Proclamation, explaining the motives which induced him to undertake the war; and, on the 27th of March, 1639, his coronation-day, he put himself at the head of his army, and proceeded to Scotland[2].

The Archbishop's share in this transaction, though he did no more than what he was compelled to do by the warrant of the Privy Council, procured for him afterwards the modest appellation of "incendiary," of one that "laboured to set the two nations into a bloody war." Let us, however, hear his own decla-

[1] Heylin, p. 357, 358. Coll. MSS. fol. vol. i. p. 657.

[2] Heylin, p. 358, 359. Diary, p. 56.

rations on the subject, after he was in prison, which none of his enemies controverted. "God knows," says he, "I laboured long for peace, till I received a great check for my labour. And particularly at the beginning of these tumults, when the miseries of a war first began, in the year 1638, openly at the Council Table, at Theobalds, *my counsel alone* prevailed for peace and forbearance, in hope that the Scots would think better of their obedience[1]."

After a variety of transactions, generally unfortunate for the King, a temporary pacification was agreed to, on the 17th of July, and ratified by the King on the 18th, after which he returned to London, nominating the Earl of Traquair his Lord High Commissioner. Nevertheless, the mutual jealousies had not subsided; no sooner was the treaty concluded than it was broken by the Covenanters, and the war commenced the following year with redoubled violence. Our attention, however, must be more immediately confined to the Archbishop. On the 3d of April we find him reconciled to the Queen, with whom he was now on terms of intimate friendship[2]. On the 4th of June he received two seditious and scurrilous papers, written by Lilburne, then in the Fleet prison; the one abusing him to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, the other inciting the Apprentices of London to attack his palace. These he delivered to the Lords of the

[1] History of Troubles and Trials, p. 76. 78. [2] Diary, 76.

Council the 5th of June, but his moderation seems to have inflicted no farther censure on this fierce and daring enthusiast [1].

But, in the midst of these national commotions and attacks of fanatical hatred, it is pleasing to find this great man unmoved, and still appearing the patron of literature and learned men. On the 28th of June, he sent 576 volumes of Manuscripts to Oxford, being what he calls the remainder, and above 100 of these were Hebrew, Persian, and Arabic. "I had formerly sent them," says he, "above 700 volumes [2]." Such was his zeal for literature, that he spared no expence to benefit that venerable seat of learning, where he himself had first been taught to appreciate the value of knowledge.

Another of the Archbishop's actions this year must not be forgotten. He had already caused the Scottish Liturgy to be translated into Latin; for, as that language, though it had long ceased to be vernacular, was still the language of learned men, he wished the whole world to judge of the conduct of the Scots, as to the truth of their allegations that it was Popish. The work, unfortunately, though finished, was never published, his troubles coming on apace. Still, there was the Liturgy of England, in many respects the same, translated into various languages, by which an adequate judgment could be formed of the conduct of the Scottish schismatics.

[1] Diary, p. 56. Remains, fol. vol. ii. p. 178, 179, 180.

[2] Diary, p. 56. Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. Heylin, p. 379, 380.

It had undergone various translations: the first, that of King Edward VI. into Latin, by Alexander Alice, or Alesius, a learned Scotsman, of the University of St. Andrew's, who fled from the vengeance of Archbishop Beaton, at the commencement of that tumultuous Reformation; the second Liturgy of that prince, at the command of Elizabeth, by Dr. Walter Haddon, the learned President of Magdalen College, Oxford. It had also been translated into French, for the use of Jersey, Guernsey, and the other Norman British Isles: while Dr. Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, when Lord Keeper, procured its translation into Spanish. Our Archbishop was not behind, and Petley, of Oxford, at his instance, translated it into the Greek language, "that so," says Heylin, "the Eastern Churches might have as clear information of the English piety as the Western[1]."

But had Archbishop Laud done nothing more, his procuring and recommending the famous Dr. Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter, to write his immortal treatise, entitled, "Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted," and published in 1640, is sufficient to endear his memory to the lovers of apostolical and primitive order. The Scots had publicly branded Episcopacy as unlawful and antichristian, and it was to counteract this that Laud prevailed upon Hall to undertake the work. It failed, doubtless, to convince those enthusiasts; but it is an invaluable de-

[1] Heylin, p. 377, 378.

posit delivered to the Church of England, by one of the most pious and illustrious of its sons.

The first sketch of the work was transmitted to the Archbishop at Lambeth, in October, 1639. In this original draught, which Hall sent to the Primate in manuscript, he laid down two propositions, 1. That Episcopacy is a lawful, most ancient, holy, and divine institution, and, therefore, where it hath obtained, it cannot be violated without a manifest contempt of God's ordinance. And, 2. That Presbyterianism hath no authority in Scripture, or from the practice of the Church for 1500 years, though it be disguised with the fallacious names of Christ's kingdom and ordinance; and though it may be useful in some cities and countries wherein Episcopal government, through the iniquity of the times, cannot be had, yet to obtrude it upon a Church otherwise settled, is utterly incongruous and unjustifiable." In the illustration of these propositions, he laid down fifteen *postulata*, to the following effect:—that apostolical institution must be divine—that the government recommended by the apostles must be apostolical—that if the apostles were inspired, what they instituted must be designed for continuance — that the universal practice of the Church in the ages succeeding the apostles, is the best comment on the practice of the apostles and their successors—that the opinion is most irreverent which induces us to believe, that the Saints and Fathers would immediately establish a polity of their own, in opposition to that of the apostles—

that had they done so, still, in the very nature of things, it could not have been universal—that the writings of the first Fathers of the Church are more worthy of credit than those of modern theologians —that those whom the primitive Church and Fathers condemned as obstinate heretics, are not to be followed as authorities for church government—that the accession of titles and distinctions makes no difference in the fundamental truth—that the tenets which are new and unheard of in the previous history of the Church are justly liable to suspicion—in short, that "to depart from the practice of the Universal Church of Christ from the time of the apostles, and to betake ourselves to a new custom, cannot but be odious and highly scandalous [1]."

These *postulata* were certainly conclusive, as were also the two propositions; but the acuteness and sagacity of Laud led him at once to perceive the advantage which the Presbyterians would take over them, for, though the *postulata* were undeniable, yet the second proposition, if it could be got over in no other way, would be immediately attacked on the ground of expediency. He accordingly suggested a variety of alterations to Hall, which were adopted, and which made Neal, after his usual manner, declare that the treatise was altered contrary to the Bishop's inclination, though he has purposely forgot to inform us of the reasons for Hall's acquiescence. The letter which he sent to the

[1] Heylin, p. 374, 375.

Bishop, containing his suggestions, is given by Heylin, his own chaplain, and I extract part of it, that the reader, on comparison with the foregoing analysis of the original plan, may see and appreciate the acuteness of Laud. "You say, under the first head," says Laud, "that Episcopacy is an ancient, holy, and divine institution. It must be holy and ancient, if divine. Would it not be more conclusive, went it thus, that because of its antiquity, it is of divine institution? Next, you define it as being joined with imparity and superiority of jurisdiction, but this seems short, for so is every Archpresbyter's or Archdeacon's place, and so is Henderson's chair at Glasgow, unless you will define it by a distinction of order. I draw the superiority not from the jurisdiction which is ascribed to Bishops *jure positivo*, in their administration of ecclesiastical matters, but from that which is intrinsical and original in the powers of excommunication. Again, you say, in the first head, that where Episcopacy hath obtained, it cannot be abdicated without violation of God's ordinance. This proposition, I conceive, is *inter minus habentes*, for never yet was there a Church where it hath not obtained. The Christian faith was never planted any where, but the very first feature of the Church was by or with Episcopacy, and wheresoever Episcopacy is not now suffered to be, it is by such an abdication, for certainly there it was *a principio*. In your second head you grant that Presbyterianism may be of use, where Episcopacy may not be had.

First, I pray you consider whether this admission be not needless here, and in itself of dangerous consequence. Next, I conceive there is *no place* where Episcopacy may not be had, if there be a Church more than in title only. Thirdly, since they affirm their Presbyterian faction to be Christ's kingdom and ordinance, (as you yourself express), and reject Episcopacy as opposed to it, we must not use any mincing terms, but unmask them plainly. Nor shall I ever refrain from declaring honest truth, though it be against Amsterdam or Geneva."

The primate then proceeds to the postulata, and objects to the two first as restrictive. "For," says he, "Episcopacy is not so to be asserted into apostolical institutions, as to restrain it from looking higher, and claiming as its founder Christ himself, though it perhaps was modified (formalized) by the Apostles. Here, however, give me leave to enlarge. The adversaries of Episcopacy are not only the furious Arian heretics, from whom are now raised Prynne, Bastwick, and our Scottish masters, but some also of milder and cunning alloy, both in the Genevan and Roman faction. And it will become the Church of England, so to vindicate herself against the furious Puritans, that she may not be wounded by either of the two more cunning and learned adversaries. Not by the Roman faction, for they are content that the Church shall be *juris divini mediati*, by, from, and under the Pope, that so the Church may be monarchical in him, and not *immediati*, which makes the Church monarchical

in the Bishops. This is the Italian rock, not the Genevan; for the Romanists will not deny Episcopacy to be *juris divini*, so you will take it, *ut suadentis vel approbantis*, but not *imperantis*, for then they do as they please, which is their usual practice. Nay, if I forget not, Beza himself is said to have acknowledged Episcopacy to be *juris divini imperantis*, so you will not take it as *universaliter imperantis*, for then Geneva might escape, and *citra considerationem durantis*; for, though they had it before, yet upon wiser thoughts, they may be without it, which Scotland says now, and whoever pleases may say after. This I am bold to add, because in your second *postulatum* I find that Episcopacy is directly commanded; but you do not altogether meet this subtlety of Beza, which is the great rock in the Lake of Geneva[1]."

The Treatise, thus amended, was published. It is not my intention to offer an analysis of this incomparable production. The venerable Bishop comments, with great severity, on the conduct of Graham, Bishop of Orkney, who had given in his recantation to a pretended Assembly at Edinburgh, and craved pardon for having accepted it, as if he had committed some heinous offence. In Section I. entitled, "An expostulatorie entrance into the question," he thus begins: "Good God! what is this I have lived to hear? A Bishop in a Christian Assembly renounce his Episcopal functions, and cry out

[1] Heylin, p. 375—377.

mercy for his now abandoned calling. Brother that was, whoever you be," exclaims the venerable prelate to Graham, " I must have leave a little while to contest seriously with you. The act was yours, the concernment that of the whole Church. You could not think so foul a deed to escape unquestioned. The world never heard of such a penance; you cannot blame us if we receive it both with wonder and expostulation, and tell you that it had been much better you had never been born, than to give such a scandal to God's Church, so deep a wound to his holy truth and ordinance. If the Tweed that runs between us were an ocean, it could neither drown nor wash out our interest or your offence. For me, I am now breathing towards the end of my race, the goal is already in mine eye, young men may speak out from ambition, or passionate transportations: I, that am now setting foot over the threshold of the house of my age, what aim can I have, but of the issue of my last account, whereto I am ready to be summoned before the Judge of quick and dead? Neither can you look, as is likely, to be long after me. Say, therefore, I beseech you, before God and his elect angels, say, what is it, (besides, perhaps, the fear of plundering a fair temporal estate by the furious multitude,) say what it can be, that induced you to this awful, this scandalous repentance? How weary should I be of this rochet, if you can shew me that Episcopacy is of any less than divine institution! Win him by your powerful arguments who is so far

from being wedded to the love of this misconceived pomp, that he envies the sweet sleep of his inferiors. Let me tell you, it is your person that aggravates your crime. For a sheep to stray is no wonder, but for a shepherd, yea, a guide and director of shepherds, (such God and the Church hath made you,) not only to wander himself, but to lead away his flock from the green pastures, and comfortable waters of divine truth, to the dry and barren deserts of human invention, cannot but be shameful and dangerous. That some poor seduced souls of your ignorant vulgar should condemn that calling which they were never suffered to look at, but with prejudiced eyes; or that some of your higher spirited clergy, out of ambition for this dignity and rage at a repulse, should snarl at the denied honour; or that some of your great ones, who do no less love the lands than they envy and hate the pre-eminence of Bishops, should cry down that sacred function, could be no other than might in these evil times be expected and even anticipated. But for a man held once worthy to be graced with the chair of Episcopacy, to spurn that once honoured seat, and to make his very profession a sin, is so shameful an indignity, as will make the wise of succeeding ages shake their heads, and not mention it without just indignation [1]."

The venerable prelate then proceeds to invite Graham to the controversy, for it is to him that the

[1] Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted, p. 1—5.

whole Treatise is ostensibly directed, "not in a vain affectation of victory, like some young sophisters, but as sober divines, in a fervent pursuit of that truth, which God and his purer Church have left and consigned to us." "But," says he, "ere we enter the lists, let me advise you, and your now master, the faction, not to deceive yourselves with the hope of hiding your heads under the skirt of the authority of those divines and churches abroad, which retain that form of government whereunto you have submitted; for know, their case and yours is widely different. They plead a necessity for that condition which you have willingly chosen. They were not, they could not be, what you were and still might have been. Did any of them forsake and abjure that Episcopacy which he might freely have enjoyed, with the full liberty of professing the reformed religion? If the last Bishop of Geneva had become a Protestant, and consented in matters of doctrine to Calvin, Farret, Viret, have you or any man living just cause to think that the city would not gladly have retained his government, and still thought themselves happy under such a protection? No man that hath either brain or forehead will affirm it; since the world knows the quarrel was not at his dignity, but at his opposition to the intended reformation. But because this is only a suggestion of a then future conditionate contingency, and may perhaps meet with some stubborn contradictions, hear what Calvin saith for himself, and his copartners. 'If they would,' saith he, 'bring unto us

such an hierarchy, wherein the Bishops shall so rule, as that they refuse not to submit themselves unto Christ, that they may depend upon him as their only head, then surely if there be those that shall not submit themselves reverently to that hierarchy, I confess there is no anathema of which they are not worthy [1].' Do you hear your doom from your own oracle? Lo! such and no other was that hierarchy [in Scotland] wherein you lately bore a part, and which you have now condemned. Note well, therefore, the merit and danger of Calvin's anathema. Yet, again, the same author, in his Confession of Faith, written in the name of all the French Churches, speaking of the depraved state of the Roman Churches, then in the *fieri* of reforming, plainly writes thus, 'Yet, in the mean time, we would not have the authority of the Church, or of those pastors or superintendents to whom the charge of governing the Church is committed, taken away; we confess, therefore, that those Bishops or pastors are reverently to be heard, so far as according to their function they teach the word of God [2].' And

[1] Calvin. De Necessitate Eccles. Reform. "Talem si nobis hierarchiam exhibeant, in qua sic emineant Episcopi ut Christo subesse non recusent, ut ab illo tanquam unico capite pendeant, &c. ad ipsum referantur, &c. tum vero nullo non anathemate dignos fatear, si qui erunt, qui non eam reverentia summaque obedientia observant."

[2] Interea tamen, Ecclesiæ authoritatem vel pastorum et superintendentium, quibus Ecclesiæ regendæ provincia mandata est, sublatam volumus. Fatemur ergo Episcopos sive pastores

yet more plainly, 'Certainly (saith he, speaking even of Popish Bishops, if they were true Bishops,) I would yield them some authority in this case, not so much as themselves desire, but so much as is required to the due order of the policy or government of the Church [1].' Lastly, for it were easy to heap up this measure, in an Epistle of his, wherein this question is discussed, what is to be done if a Popish Bishop shall be converted to the Reformed religion? he so determines it, that it is for such an one first to renounce his Popish powers of sacrificing, and profess to abstain from all the superstitions of the Romish religion, then that he must do his utmost endeavours that all the churches which belong to his bishopric may be purged from their errors and idolatries, and at last concludes that his possessions and authority should be left him, by virtue whereof he must take order, that the ministers under him do duly preach God's word, as himself must always do [2]."

I shall quote only one other truly eloquent passage from this incomparable treatise, addressed to the Scots. "Say no more, therefore, that you have conformed yourselves to the pattern and judgment

reverenter audiendos, quatenus pro suæ functionis ratione verbum Dei docent."

[1] "Sane si veri Episcopi essent, aliquid in hac parte authoritatis habuerem, non quantum sibi postulant, sed quantum ad politiam Ecclesiæ rite ordinandam requiritur." Calv. Instit. lib. iv. c. x.

[2] Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted, p. 6—9.

of some other reformed Churches: this starting hole is too strait to hide you. We can at once tenderly respect them, and justly censure you. Acts done out of an extremity can be no precedents for voluntary and deliberate resolutions. It was not so with you when those holy men, Patrick Hamilton and George Wishart, sowed the first seeds of Reformation among you in their own blood, with that spirit the Holy Ghost endued them of patience and constancy, crowned with martyrdom, not of tumult and furious opposition, to the disquiet of the state, and hazard of the Reformation itself, or to the abjuring and blaspheming of an holy order in the Church, and dishonouring of Almighty God, while they pretended to seek his honour. This was their case, but what is this to you [r] ?" Such are specimens of this treatise, written in a style of impassioned eloquence, which it would be a degradation to name with the absurdities of Henderson, who interfered more with politics than did the whole bench of Scottish Bishops; the blasphemy, impiety, obscenity, and fanaticism of Rutherford, Livingstone, Cant, Shiels, Peden, Bruce, Dickson, Kirkton, and the host of Covenanting zealots.

Yet the work of Bishop Hall did not remain unanswered. Several Presbyterian preachers, under the signature of Smectymnus, entered into a controversy with the prelate, on the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy, and the antiquity of Liturgies. In all

[r] Episcopacy by Divine Right, p. 17—19.

the discussions the Bishop has the superiority; and when the question was referred to several learned theologians in France, Holland, and Germany, they were either silent, or returned answers favourable to the Bishop. The reader will find the positions discussed at large in Bishop Hall's "Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament, 1640:"—the answers to this, by Smectymnus, entitled, "Answer to an Humble Remonstrance of a Dutiful Son of the Church, with a Vindication of the same, 1641:"—Bishop Hall's reply, entitled, "A short Answer to the tedious Vindication of Smectymnus, 1641:"—in the reply to this, "A Vindication of the Answer to an Humble Remonstrance, 1641;" and in the Bishop's rejoinder, entitled, "A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance against Smectymnus, 1641."

I have dwelt long enough, however, on this subject, though it is of great interest, and perhaps it was almost superfluous for me to have taken any lengthened notice of such a work as "Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted," which, though now scarce, ought to be in the hands of every individual, the production of a man "whose praise is in all the Churches." But the connexion which our great Primate had with it, at whose instance and recommendation it was exclusively undertaken, is a sufficient apology for any prolixity of detail. It may be observed here, that the Archbishop, who had always, since his removal to the metropolitan see, presented the King with a yearly account of his province,

which he required from the clergy with great punctuality, made this year the last of these reports. It was signed by him, Jan .2, 1639, and countersigned by the King, Feb. 10, 1639-40 [1].

But, notwithstanding these noble exertions of the Archbishop to support and strengthen the Church over which he presided, the Puritan leaders were no less indefatigable in laying their plans for its overthrow. For this purpose, a lawyer of the Middle Temple, named Bagshaw, being chosen Reader by the Temple Lawyers for the Lent vacation, began some discourses founded on the statute of 25th Edward III. in which he questioned the right of the Bishops to sit in Parliament as Lords Spiritual, and also animadverted in severe terms on the High Commission. No sooner had the Archbishop got notice of this cunning and seditious plot, than he informed the King, who gave orders to the Lord Keeper to silence the Reader. Bagshaw, finding it impossible to proceed, went to Lambeth, and gaining admittance, he was informed by the Archbishop that he had "fallen upon a subject neither safe nor seasonable, which would stick closer to him than he was aware." He began to defend and exonerate himself in a sophistical manner, but the Archbishop decided at once by a firm reply, "That his Majesty was otherwise resolved in it, and that perhaps it had been better for the Reader himself to have desisted at first, than to have incurred his Majesty's displeasure by that unseasonable adventure [2]."

[1] Remains, vol. i. p. 558—564. [2] Heylin, p. 381—383.

Much has been already said about the Archbishop's alleged inclination to Popery, nor do I intend at this time to resume the subject, for the purpose of vindicating him from the calumny. Except by a few obstinate and ignorant enthusiasts, the charge is now abandoned, and I anticipate the day as not far distant when due honour will be done to the memory of this illustrious, virtuous, and learned prelate. Yet there is an anecdote related by Heylin, who was himself a party in it, which it does not become me to omit on this occasion. In the forcible though quaint style of that learned writer, I lay it before the reader. "In the November of this year," says Heylin, "I received a message from him to attend him the next day, at two in the afternoon. The key being turned which opened the way into his study, I found him sitting in a chair with a paper in his hand, and his eyes so fixed upon the paper that he did not observe my entrance. Finding him in that posture, I thought it fit manners to retire, but the noise I made in my retreat rousing his attention, he recalled me unto him, and told me after a short pause that he well remembered he had sent for me, but he could not tell for his life what it was about. After which he was pleased to say (not without tears in his eyes), that he had then just received a letter, acquainting him with the apostacy of a person of quality in North Wales, to the Church of Rome; that he knew these frequent conversions tending to the increase of Popery would be ascribed to him and his brethren the bishops, who were least

guilty of the same; that, for his part, he had done his utmost, so far as was consistent with the rules of prudence and the preservation of the Church, to suppress that party, and to bring its leaders to condign punishment. To the truth whereof, lifting up his wet eyes to heaven, he took God to witness, conjuring me, as I would answer it to God at the day of judgment, that if ever I were promoted to any of those places which he and his brethren, by reason of their great age, were not likely long to hold, I would employ the abilities which God had given me to suppress the Romish party, who by their *open undertakings*, and *secret practices*, were likely to prove the ruin of this flourishing Church [1]."

We now, however, approach another important period, namely, the year 1640. The rebellion of the Scots, which it is foreign to my present purpose to detail thoughout all its stages from the establishment of the Covenant, was now assuming an alarming aspect, increased by the practices of the Puritan schismatics in England, and also by the secret designs of the Romish emissaries. Traquair had been nominated the King's High Commissioner to Scotland, but the ambiguous conduct of that nobleman laid him open to the suspicion that he was favourable to the Presbyterian enthusiasts. The King, wearied and mortified by his disappointments, resolved at last to call a Parliament.

[1] Heylin, p. 386, 387.

The first proposers of this Parliament were the Archbishop of Canterbury, Wentworth, now Earl of Strafford, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and the Marquis of Hamilton; and at the same time it was voted at the council table, that the King should be assisted in every manner, if the Parliament should prove refractory and refuse supplies [1]. This is a remarkable fact, and tends at once to shew the falsehood of the assertion, that it was the intention of Laud and Wentworth to establish a despotism, and to make the King independent of the people; for Laud was by no means ignorant of the feeling which would most likely be displayed in the Parliament, since every day produced fresh libels against him. Yet, in the midst of this opposition, we find him the original mover for a Parliament, which in all probability would contain a considerable number of his avowed enemies. Is it possible, then, to conceive, that the man who acted thus, in the view of impending danger, (for certainly, had he consulted his own interest, he would have deprecated such a measure,) could be stimulated by any sinister motives to enslave his country, or that he and Strafford were in league to supplant the fundamental principles of the constitution? Here was a display of virtue; a preference of public good to private safety; for let it be recollected, too, that the very words which he used at the Council Table, he having proposed that extraordinary supplies should be voted if the Par-

[1] Diary, p. 57. Troubles and Trials, p. 230.

liament proved *peevish*, were afterwards imputed to him as an enormous crime, and animadverted upon with the usual display of Puritan illiberality and intemperate malignity.

On the 13th of April, 1640, the Parliament assembled, specifically called to consider Scottish affairs. The opening sermon was preached by the Bishop of Ely, and on the following day the Convocation met in the chapter-house of St. Paul's. The King, in a short speech to the Parliament, acquainted them with the rebellious designs and proceedings of the Scottish Covenanters, and hoped that their co-operation would not be wanting to reduce them to obedience. Opposition, nevertheless, was manifested from the first. Notwithstanding the luminous speech of the Lord Keeper Finch, and the urgent necessity of affairs, the Commons launched out into the most extravagant complaints, and insisted that their grievances should be redressed, and a committee be appointed to investigate religion, before any supplies could be granted to the King.

This was a sufficient proof to the Archbishop that his ruin had been determined[1]; for, in their committee of religion, they would, as a matter of course, commence a clamour against him, without investigating the foundation of their opposition. This they had done before, and the issue proved that they were resolved still to proceed in the same manner. It was to no purpose that they were told by the King, that there was never a prince who had

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 230, 231.

greater cause to call together his people than himself; they began to question the proceedings of the last parliament, particularly the conduct of Sir John Finch, the Speaker, and they had debated six days on their own affairs, without considering the object for which they were assembled. That they had contrived the ruin of the Archbishop is undeniable, and this they could not otherwise promote than in their committee for religion. Strafford, also, was not forgotten, and him they determined to look after in due time. On the 24th of April, a discussion arose in the House of Lords, whether the King's affairs or the alleged grievance of the subject should be first debated; when the former was voted. This gave great offence to the Commons; they commenced a clamorous dispute about the violation of their privileges, insisted that the House of Lords had no right to vote supplies, and declared that they would proceed in no business till they had received satisfaction from the House of Peers, which they demanded next day in a public conference. The Upper House indeed made an apology, asserting, that all supplies ought first to begin in the Commons, and that, after being passed by the Peers, it was the usual procedure to return the Bill to the Lower House, who were then to present it to the King by the Speaker. This, however, had no effect. A committee was instantly appointed to examine precedents, and in the mean time *all business* was ordered to be suspended till that committee should report.

These ridiculous and unseasonable proceedings could not fail to irritate the King. Those men might have known, that by their cunning delays they were virtually involving the King in perplexing difficulties; in truth, they were guilty of openly sanctioning that seditious and rebellious spirit which it was their duty to suppress. After having sat three weeks, the King made his last request through his secretary, Sir Henry Vane, a man who has the infamous character of betraying his sovereign, of the necessity for a sudden supply; a debate ensued, which occupied two days, and the eloquence of Glanville the Speaker had almost proved effectual, when Vane, by a falsehood as bold as its malice was unfathomable, frustrated every attempt towards a compliance with the King's demands. The temper of the Parliament was now too evident, and on the 5th of May it was dissolved by royal proclamation. The King afterwards published a vindication of himself, entitled, "His Majesty's Declaration to all his Loving Subjects, of the causes which moved him to dissolve the last Parliament," printed at London, 4to. 1640.

It is impossible to reflect on the proceedings of this Parliament, without a feeling of grief for the unhappy situation of the King. An assembly of this kind the nation had not beheld for many years; we are informed, indeed, that the people had almost forgotten the nature and uses of that great deliberative council, and now their expectations were raised that harmony would be restored. Such,

however, was not the intention of the Puritan faction: their agents, who sanctioned the Scottish rebellion, were busy in promoting their designs, and the elections had been distinguished for more than an ordinary display of fanatical violence. There is not the slightest evidence to prove, that their demands would not have been partly conceded, had they first turned their attention to the King's necessities; even Strafford, whose admirable government of Ireland procured a vote of thanks from that turbulent nation to the King, for placing over them so just, wise, and vigilant a governor, had given his advice that all ought to be relinquished, rather than make a breach; and this, at least, is evident, that the King's subsidies ought first to have been considered, before they adventured, in those times of hazard and distress, to discuss their own grievances, one half of which were visionary, or to appoint committees on religion, thereby entering on a subject, the opinions on which were multifarious, and on which they had as little ability as legal right to decide.

The Convocation, nevertheless, continued to sit, but not before the Archbishop had satisfied himself as to the legality of its continuance. For this he had the authority of the Lord Keeper Finch, and several other distinguished lawyers, and also a precedent in the Convocation of 1586. They had continued to sit, because, having agreed to aid the King by six subsidies, payable in six years, amounting in all to 120,000*l.* the King was not in a situa-

tion to lose that sum. The Archbishop, indeed, had resolved to dismiss the Convocation, and had actually sent to do so; but, recollecting that he had not the King's writ to that effect, he found it necessary to be possessed of the same authority for dismissing which he had for convening it; and when he sought the King to issue the writ, he received a reply that the subsidies could not be lost, that its continuance was legal, and that it could not be dissolved. Still the Archbishop was not satisfied; and well knowing the disposition of the times towards him, it was not until he received a document, signed by Finch, Manchester, Bramton, Littleton, Whitfield, Bankes, and Heath, members of the Privy Council, or barristers, that he would proceed. This warrant testified, that the Convocation called by the King's writ, under the Great Seal, doth continue, until it be dissolved by writ or commission under the Great Seal. "This judgment," says the Archbishop, "of these great lawyers, settled both Houses of Convocation, so we proceeded according to the power given us under the Broad Seal, as is required by the statute of 25th Henry VIII. c. 19. In the Convocation thus continued, we made up our act complete for the gift of six subsidies, according to ancient form in that behalf, and delivered it under seal to his Majesty. This passed, *nemine refragante*, as may appear, *apud acta*. And we followed a precedent in Archbishop Whitgift's time, anno 1586, who was known to be a wise and a prudent prelate, and a man not

given to do boisterous things, against the laws of the realm, and the prerogative of the crown [1]."

In this Convocation seventeen canons were passed, which, as Lord Clarendon observes, (as formerly quoted) bear more against Socinianism than the acts of any other Christian assembly. They were published in 4to. this year, under the authority of the Great Seal, and are entitled, "Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, treated upon by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Presidents of the Convocations for the respective Provinces of Canterbury and York, and the rest of the Bishops and Clergy of those Provinces," and are accompanied by a royal proclamation. The titles of the several heads are, 1. Concerning regal power. 2. For the better keeping of the day of his Majesty's most happy inauguration. 3. For suppressing the growth of Popery. 4. Against Socinianism, which is termed a "damnable and cursed heresy," a "wicked and blasphemous heresy." 5. Against sectaries, to-wit, "Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, Familists, or other sect or sects." 6. An oath enjoined for the preventing of all innovations in doctrine and government [2]. 7. A declaration concerning some

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 79, 80.

[2] Ecclesiastical Canons, 4to. London, 1640. p. 33, 34. "I, A. B. do swear, that I approve the doctrine and discipline, or government, established in the Church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation. And that I will not endeavour by myself, or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any Popish doctrine, contrary to that which is established. Nor will

rites and ceremonies. 8. Of preaching for conformity. 9. One Book of Articles to be used at all parochial visitations. 10. Concerning the consecration of the clergy. 11. Chancellors' patents. 12. Chancellors alone not to censure any of the clergy in sundry cases. 13. Excommunication and absolution not to be pronounced but by a priest. 14. Concerning commutations, and the disposal of them. 15. Touching concurrent jurisdictions. 16. Concerning licences to marry. 17. Against vexatious citations [1].

The Convocation sat till the 29th of May, and rose after establishing these canons, a subscription to which was scrupled by the Bishop of Gloucester. Though these canons are not only judicious, but positively unobjectionable, yet they occasioned much trouble to the Archbishop, and many specimens of Puritan rhetoric against them and the oath were exhibited in the

I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church, by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, and Archdeacons, &c. as it stands now established, and as by right it ought to stand, nor yet ever to subject it to the usurpations and superstitions of the See of Rome. And these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation or mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever. And this I do heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the faith of a Christian. So help me God, and Jesus Christ."

[1] See Ecclesiastical Canons, 4to. 1640. Collier's Ecclesiastical Hist. vol. ii. Nalson's Collections, vol. i. p. 545. As also, "A Grant of the Benevolence or Contribution of the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury." 4to. London, 1640.

ensuing Parliament, which passed an act declaring them illegal and void, as containing in them "many matters contrary to the King's prerogative, to the fundamental laws and statutes of the realm, to the right of Parliament, to the property and liberty of the subject, and matters tending to sedition and of dangerous consequence [1]." But nothing could be more absurd than this censure, for, in reality, they were so condemned, because it had previously been resolved to condemn them; and, so far from containing any thing contrary to the laws, had the religious zealots only studied them, they would have found them strictly guarding the rights of the subject and the welfare of religion. But in those wretched times the Puritans had not learned moderation. Nay, so admirable were they thought by some, that one of the most violent opposers of the ship-money blessed God that he had lived to see such good effects of a Convocation. Yet they were afterwards imputed to the Archbishop as a heinous crime; and his enemies, not content with this, gave him the whole credit for the Parliament's hasty dissolution, "of which," says he emphatically, "I was not guilty." Their charge was, that he had voted subsidies to the King in the Convocation; and it availed not to tell them that the act was not his, but that of the whole Convocation, for which he had sufficient warrant. Concerning the canons, he thus forcibly remarks: "If by any inadvertency, or human frailty, any thing erroneous

[1] Rushworth, vol. iii. p. 1365.

or unfit has stepped into these Canons, I humbly beseech your Lordships to remember that it is an Article of the Church of England that General Councils may err, (Art. XI.) and therefore this national synod may mistake." "As for the oath," says he in another place, "so bitterly spoken of at the bar, and in the Articles, either it was made according to law, or we were wholly misled by precedent, and that, too, as had never been excepted against in any former time. For in the canons passed during the reign of King James, there was an oath made against simony, (Can. 40.) an oath for church-wardens, (Can. 8.) an oath about licences for marriages, (Can. 103.) and an oath for judges in ecclesiastical courts, (Can. 127.) and some of these oaths as dangerous as this is reckoned, yet established by no other authority than these; while neither these canons nor oaths were ever declared illegal by any ensuing parliament, nor the framers of them accused of any crime, much less of treason [1]."

The charge, however, resolved itself generally into this, that it was against law for the Convocation to sit when the Parliament was dissolved. Now, as the Archbishop himself remarked, this was not the fact, for the Bishops were summoned to the Convocation by a different writ from that which called them to Parliament. If it be granted, as indeed it must, that the power of dissolving the Parliament rests in the King; that it can neither

[1] History of Troubles, p. 79, 80, 81. 280—284.

meet until summoned by a formal writ, and cannot sit without rebellion after it is prorogued or dissolved, nor discontinue its sittings except by the same authority, it follows, that the same power can be exercised over the Convocation, which, though an ecclesiastical or spiritual assembly, yet, as composed of men who are still the subjects of civil government, is also under the same control. If the King found it necessary to dissolve the Parliament for injudicious conduct, it does not follow that he ought to have dissolved the Convocation, the members of which did not imitate the Parliament. It is clear that the Convocation could not discontinue its sittings, till dismissed by the same authority which permitted it to assemble; and the anxiety of the Archbishop to know whether or not the clergy were acting legally, is sufficient evidence of the malice of the accusation against him. If there was an error, (which remains to be proved,) the error rested with the King, who withheld the writ under the Great Seal, not with the clergy, many of whom had considerable scruples; and not so much with the King, who had a right to prolong the Convocation till the subsidies were arranged, as with those legal advisers whose names, along with that of the Lord Keeper Finch, are affixed to the warrant transmitted to the Archbishop for the continuance of the Convocation.

To this it may be answered, that, after the dissolution of the Parliament, the Convocation had no right to enact canons, and that these were not valid without the ratification of Parliament. But this is

saying that the Convocation was under the control of Parliament, and could do nothing but what the latter pleased; an assertion which is characteristic of those who would arrogate to parliaments those monstrous powers which would, if possible, trample on the prerogatives inherent in the throne. It is not denied that the acts of the Convocation must necessarily be sanctioned by the national assembly, but certainly those acts only which tend to material alterations in the ecclesiastical constitution. For the alteration of the Church from Episcopacy to any species of sectarianism, whether Presbyterianism, Independency, or Popery, is a very different thing from enacting Canons against Socianism, Popery, and the other subjects to which these seventeen Canons relate. In the one case, the sanction of parliament is indispensable, because there is a change affecting the community at large; in the other, the royal sanction is all that is required, because these Canons are enacted on the received doctrines of the Church. The Convocation was strictly as independent as the Parliament, both existing by the same authority, that of the King. Hence, the former court was only recognizable by Parliament, when its members presumed to alter the constitution of the Church, which, of course, had a civil tendency; or to introduce new doctrines, such as had never been received or ratified by the Parliament at any former period. In the present case, therefore, it was not against law to sit after the dissolution of Par-

liament, and it was malevolent in the extreme to charge it upon the Archbishop. It must not be forgotten that the parliaments of this reign assumed the most unwarrantable powers; that it is comparatively of little importance whether tyranny be exercised by one individual or a body of individuals, if unhappily it be exercised; and we have abundant evidence in the case of the Long Parliament, that a national assembly, when it sets at defiance the salutary restraints of law, can exhibit one of the most perfect specimens of tumultuous despotism which the page of history records. The intention of such men, in plain language, is to contract the regal power for the purpose of extending their own.

One remark more respecting the Canons. They received the approbation of the Privy Council, were subscribed by the two Houses of Convocation, (accompanied by thirty-six protests,) and also by the Convocation of the province of York, and then ratified under the Great Seal. Neal, the Puritan historian, asserts, that in the canon against Socinianism, those heretics are not once mentioned. This, however, is wilful perversion of language. The pronoun *they* under the canon "against Socinianism," cannot be misunderstood. That writer, as well as Hume, ridicules the *&c.* in the oath, as unintelligible. This too is sophistical quibbling. It means as a matter of course, the Church of England as governed by archbishops, bishops, &c., which Lord

Digby well understood, when in an inflammatory and fanatical speech, he termed it "the bottomless perjury of an *et cetera*."

The feeling, however, entertained by the seditious enthusiasts against the Archbishop, was not to be silenced by reason and moderation. He was charged with being the sole cause of the Parliament's dissolution; whereas, he had hardly a single vote in the measure; which he offered to prove on his trial, but which his enemies of course prohibited. For the Lords of the Council were summoned, as he himself tells us, by the King, and on Tuesday, the 5th of May, they met in the Council-Chamber, at six in the morning. The Archbishop was warned to be in attendance from Lambeth at seven o'clock, by a mistake of the messenger, who ought to have summoned him at six, which he also offered to prove, but was as usual refused. When he did arrive, he found the resolutions already taken: Lord Cottington being in the middle of his speech when the Archbishop entered. "All votes," says he, "concurred by the ending of that Parliament save two: the persons dissenting were the Earls of Northumberland and Holland. I co-operated nothing to this breach but my single vote [1]."

Yet on the following day, libels were exhibited against the Archbishop in various parts of London [2].

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 78, 79.

[2] "Libels were set up in divers parts of the city, animating and calling together Apprentices and others to come and meet in

The furious and seditious Lilburne caused a paper to be posted on the Old Exchange, on the 9th of May, inciting the Apprentices of London to attack and burn Lambeth Palace on the following Monday; and the members of the Convocation were in such continual danger of being drawn out during their sittings, and butchered by the rabble, that it was found necessary to place a guard at Westminster Abbey, where they were sitting. On Monday, May 11th, the day mentioned by Lilburne, about 500 persons assembled, and proceeded to Lambeth, but the Archbishop, having had previous notice of their atrocious intentions, secured the Palace as well as he could, and retired for a few days to his apartments at Whitehall; otherwise he would have been undoubtedly sacrificed to their rage. The next day, he procured some pieces of cannon, which he planted at the great gate of the Palace, and at other places opening towards the garden, to serve as objects of terror, lest another attack should be meditated. Some of the rioters were apprehended, and committed to Southwark prison; but, three days after, the confederates assembled, broke open the prison, and set their associates at liberty. One, however, was taken, and it having been proved that the rioters assembled with unlawful intentions by beat of drum, he was condemned for treason, May 21, on the statute of 25 Edward III. and was hanged, drawn,

St. George's Fields, for the Hunting of William the Fox, for the breach of the Parliament."

and quartered; which seasonable punishment put an end to the insurrection [1].

The libels against the Archbishop, however, were not restrained by the punishment of this seditious rioter. The Covenanting rebels of Scotland advanced into England, allured by the Puritan faction with a promise that Presbyteranism would become the established form of the Church of England; and the King proceeded against them, bravely encountering the almost overwhelming difficulties in which he was involved. This expedition ended in the treaty of Ripon. In the mean time, during the King's absence, a libel was found in Covent Garden, on the 22d of August, inciting the soldiers and apprentices to fall upon the Archbishop. It produced, however, no commotion, the rabble being probably restrained by the terrors of justice. On the 21st of September he also received a letter signed by a person unknown, in which the writer intimated, that while he was travelling through the Bishopric of Durham, he heard it openly declared by the Covenanters, that they hoped to see him shortly meet the dark fate of the Duke of Buckingham; and the writer concluded by advising him to be on his guard. Fearing that the rabble would give him another visit at Lambeth Palace, he ordered the High Commission Court to assemble at St. Paul's. His apprehensions were not groundless; for on the 22d of October, about 2000 fanatics, named Brownists, or

[1] Heylin, p. 424, 425. Diary, p. 57, 58. Nalson, vol. i. folio, London, 1682, p. 343, 344.

Independents and Anabaptists, commenced a tumultuous uproar in the Court, destroyed the benches in the Consistory, and exclaimed that they would have no Bishops, no High Commission. Here, also, it was found necessary to station a guard to repel the furious Puritans, who had now, observes Heylin, "grown so audacious in these disorders, partly from the near approach of the Parliament, but principally by the invasion of the Scots, that they contemned the law, and defied the magistrates[1]."

These were all sufficient indications to the Archbishop of his approaching ruin, and indeed he seems to have been long aware that he would fall a victim to fanatical schism and rebellion, and to have prepared himself for it with heroic fortitude. "Now verging," says his chaplain, "towards the age of seventy years, the period which the Psalmist has assigned to the life of man, there wanted not many sad presages of his fall and death." Long had his ruin been meditated by the Puritans. From the first moment of his entrance into public life, their persecutions and calumnies had been bitter and unrelenting. His enemies were many and powerful: the faction to which they adhered every day acquiring strength by the wild fanaticism and rebellion engendered by the northern Covenanters. The whole of the Puritans were arrayed against him, whether Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents, Familists, Gospellers: the Jesuits, too, had intrigued against him who was the greatest enemy

[1] Heylin, p. 125. Diary, p. 58, 59. Whitelock, p. 34, 35.

which Rome ever had since the days of Luther; and Puritans, Monks, and Covenanters, all united in one common cause. Many of the nobility, and almost the whole of the Scottish nation were leagued against him; several of whom forgot the signal services he had rendered them, in their haste to exult ingloriously over the ruin of an upright man, venerable from his age, his virtues, and the sanctity of his Episcopal character. The Puritans, who charged him with what they were pleased to term innovations in religion, and who falsely alleged that he was the original promoter of the troubles, because he had so often restrained their seditious practices: —the Jesuits, because his vigorous conduct had defeated their designs, and his learning had produced a volume which Rome has felt, and will never cease to feel, while she retains her deluding superstitions and her destructive politics:—the nobility, because his integrity made him disdain the petty artifices of courts, and the dastardly intrigues of faction, and because his zeal for justice sometimes transported him into an incautious and hasty warmth of expression, by which he refused to listen to the insinuations of corruption:—and, finally, the Scottish Covenanters, among whom the Calvinistic tenets had widely spread, exasperated because they conceived him to be the main instrument in maintaining the apostolical order of the Scottish Church, and falsely charging him with the composition and introduction of that admirable Liturgy, which the miserable old women, stimulated by Henderson, Dickson,

Cant, and others, were the ignoble and inglorious agents in defeating by riot, tumult, profanation, and rebellion. All these, dissimilar and opposite as they were in their sentiments and dispositions, combined together for the destruction of this great and illustrious man.

These portentous appearances could not fail to fill the mind of the venerable Primate with apprehensions, and the pious ejaculations in his Diary sufficiently evince his composure, notwithstanding the disasters he had in prospect. Yet these appearances indicated not the ruin of this venerable man alone. The Church of England was identified with him—that Church whose welfare he had so much at heart; the holy doctrines and apostolical constitution of which it had been invariably his endeavour to maintain; day and night had this Church been the object of his solicitude; for it he had shed tears in public and in private; "a glorious fabric," says Echard, "which, with frequent repairings, had stood the full age of mankind, fourscore years, with all the appearance of strength and firmness; but now its ruin began to be apparent, hastened by the unskilfulness of the late artificers, and the treachery of some of the workmen, as well as all the violent attacks from without."

If, in recording the actions of the now venerable Laud, it be lawful, without incurring the charge of weakness, to notice other appearances which indicated his misfortunes and his martyrdom; these, it appears, were not wanting, nor did they fail, in this

his present state of excitement, to make an impression upon his mind. It has indeed been thence insinuated, from certain entries in the Diary, that in private he was superstitious to excess, and that his notations of dreams and other occurrences prove his mental failings. To remind such persons of the dreams and visions of the night, through which the Divine Being revealed his will to his ancient servants under the Old Testament ritual, would perhaps call forth a profane sneer and attack on divine revelation itself: and yet there are times when even a dream can rouse the fears of the most courageous. The Archbishop himself says, while he has noted the remarkable dream he had of his father, Jan. 24, 1639, who appeared, and beckoned him away, that, though he was not moved with dreams, he thought fit to remember it. On another occasion, he has thus written: "October 27, (1640,) Tuesday, St. Simon and St. Jude's eve, I went into my upper study to see some MSS. which I was sending to Oxford. In that study hung my picture, taken to the life, and entering, I found it fallen down upon the face, and lying on the floor, the string being broken by which it was suspended against the wall." Then follows a remark, which even a stoic philosopher might have made on this unexpected circumstance, and in the Archbishop's peculiar situation, without incurring the censures of his sect—"I am almost every day threatened with my ruin in Parliament, God grant this be no omen." Here, surely, there was no

superstitious leaning to what are termed *omens;* the remark was natural and consistent.

It may be replied, that the Archbishop's conduct in this respect was weak and unworthy of him: but to this it is answered, that allowances must be made for the age, nor do I pretend to say that he was free from mental failings. This, however, is no proof of weakness, nor does it justify the sneer of ridicule; still less does it prove that his religion was mixed with superstition. It is admitted that these remarks in his Diary are to be accounted for from his excitement of mind, from which no man can always claim exemption; but there is not the slightest evidence that Laud was ever a believer in supernatural appearances. The insinuation is a libel on the memory of a great man; and it must not be forgotten, that his enemies, the Papists, and the so much commended Puritans and Covenanters, were believers in the most extravagant supernatural absurdities—witchcraft, sorcery, enchantment, and every ridiculous superstition, being equally received by their credulity. And who will pretend to charge that religion which Laud professed as tinctured with superstition? The greatest men are liable to peculiar failings in this state of imperfection: the recording, magnifying, exulting in them, and drawing unwarrantable inferences from them, though set off by an affected display of enlightened feelings, are the certain characteristics of a weak and pusillanimous mind. Finally, and chiefly, it must not be for-

gotten, that the Puritans themselves were the principal observers of, and believers in, those occurrences, which they afterwards remembered as signs from Heaven of the Archbishop's fall, and which afforded themes for their poets, and their fanatic preachers. In this respect Heylin himself has been misled. On the 27th of December, 1639, a violent storm arose, which made havoc among the boats on the Thames. One of the Archbishop's servants was fortunately detained from home in London, for the wind blew down two chimnies above his chamber, which would infallibly have killed him by the fall. On that night, too, a pinnacle fell from the steeple of Croydon church, and beat in the roof; damage was also done to the Cathedral at Canterbury, as also in various places of the kingdom; yet a furious enthusiast, whom the learned Henry Wharton well termed a "notorious villain," in that lying and scandalous pamphlet of his, entitled, "Cathedral Newes from Canterbury," (published in 4to. London, 1644,) has the impiety to assert, that these were all judgments sent from Heaven on the Archbishop, to indicate his fate. Prynne, in his Breviat, not unwillingly copied Culmer's falsehoods, which misled Heylin in many particulars.

But not one of the least of the Archbishop's misfortunes this year was the death of his venerable friend, and the patron of his fortunes, Dr. Richard Neile, Archbishop of York. This singularly virtuous and pious prelate had been his friend and confident on every emergency, had co-operated with

him in every plan for the welfare of the Church and the advancement of religion; and Laud had repaid his kindness by many signal acts of gratitude. This venerable prelate died, full of years and honour, only three days before the meeting of the Long Parliament—happy, since he lived not to witness the misfortunes of the primate, and the downfall of the Church,—happy, too, since he witnessed not the disasters of a prince whom he loved, and the persecutions of the clergy, to whom he had been invariably a kind and lenient governor, the overthrow of primitive order and civil government, the triumph of fanaticism, hypocrisy, and rebellion. His merits had procured for him remarkable promotions. "He had passed," says a writer, "through all the degrees and orders of the Church of England, having been schoolmaster, curate, vicar, parson, chaplain, Master of the Savoy, Dean of Westminster, Clerk of the Closet to two kings, successively Bishop of Rochester, Lichfield and Coventry, Lincoln, Durham, and Winchester, and finally Archbishop of York." The end of this excellent prelate was peaceful and affecting, imploring a blessing on the Church which he loved, and on the doctrines which it had received. Well was it, indeed, for those who died at the verge of this unnatural ferment, while the clouds of rebellion were lowering over our constitution, ready to burst with overwhelming violence, when the chilling and pernicious blasts blew fearfully from the North.

CHAPTER XX.

1640—1641.

Meeting of the Long Parliament—Proceedings of the members—Their practices against the Archbishop—Impeachment of Strafford—Impeachment and flight of Lord Keeper Finch and Secretary Windebanke—Arrest of Strafford—Examination of the Archbishop—Deprivation of the Bishops—Debates on the Canons—Practices of the Scottish Presbyterians—Impeachment of the Archbishop—Speeches of various members of the Commons—Arrest of the Archbishop—Remarkable injustice of his enemies—Articles exhibited against the Archbishop—The Primate's reply—His defence—His committal to the Tower—Practices of the Puritans—Their libellous publications—Farther injustice of the Archbishop's enemies—Aspect of the Times.

We have now arrived at the era of the Long Parliament—that republican assembly, the leaders of which began their iniquity by murdering the noble Strafford, and the venerable Laud, and completed their crimes by the murder of their sovereign, the overthrow of the constitution, the establishment of usurpation and popular despotism. My details, however, are now drawing to a close: and I strictly confine myself to the Archbishop's misfortunes, and to his tragical end; feeling assured that there are few who, after a candid investigation

of Archbishop Laud's conduct and care for religion, will refuse the tear of sympathy for his fate, or deny him the appellation given him by the learned Henry Wharton, who has appropriately termed him "that blessed saint and martyr, William Laud."

"See the world's glory once now sits forlorn,
Exposed to foreign and domestic scorn—
Britannia, who so many foes withstood,
Her bowels torn by her own viperous brood.
Her sons, most damnably religious grown,
Canted the Diadem and Mitre down,
And zealously usurp'd both Church and Crown.
Behold the axe, stained with the royal gore,
A crime unknown to Pagans heretofore;
Whence they their own fanatic zeal applaud
On loyal Strafford and on pious Laud [1]."

Previous, however, to this meeting, the public mind had been wrought up to the highest pitch of excitement. A parliament, summoned at such an emergency, and while the nation resounded with discontent and clamour, was sure to employ men's eager expectations—"a parliament," says Mr. Hume, "which, from the situation of public affairs, could not be abruptly dissolved, and which was to execute every thing left unfinished by former parliaments: these views, so important and interesting, engaged the attendance of all the members, and the House of Commons was never observed to be, from the beginning, so numerous and frequent [2]."

[1] Nalson.

[2] Hume's History, vol. vi. p. 367. edit. 1773. London.

The most vigorous preparations had been made towards a change of government. Pym, Hampden, and others, entertaining an implacable hatred towards the Court, had long watched with secret satisfaction the progress of opposition. Their ambition having been disappointed in their attempts to be employed in offices of trust, and imagining themselves injured by some proceedings against them, which their turbulence had made necessary, it was natural for those men to league with the factious, and to plot the destruction of those in authority. For this purpose Hampden had proceeded yearly to Scotland, and Pym made a like excursion through the English counties; private meetings had been held to mature their schemes, and the elections exhibited those appearances of faction which demagogues study to promote when they would inflame the passions of the people. Religion was their principal pretence; and the answer of Hampden is a complete index to their designs, who, when asked by a friend why they pretended religion, when liberty, property, and temporal matters, were their real objects, replied, "Should we not use the pretence of religion, the people would not be persuaded to assist us."

It is needless, however, to comment at large on the characters of those Parliamentary Reformers. While some of them were undeniably distinguished men, they had all proceeded to Parliament with their prejudices deeply rooted, resolved to accomplish their dark designs, without regard to principle

or rectitude. Lenthall, a Bencher of Lincoln's Inn, was chosen speaker, who was influenced more by the command of the King to accept the office, than by any desire of his own[1]. Four days had the Commons sat discussing smaller matters, when at once the storm arose, couched in the language of complaints and grievances.

As in those days a Committee for Religion was reckoned indispensably necessary by the Parliament, that Committee was speedily appointed. A similar Committee was also appointed for Irish affairs. Petitions were forthwith presented from the enthusiasts, whose sedition had involved them in punishment and exile, from Leighton, Bastwick, Prynne, Burton, and Lilburne; those grand incendiaries, doubtless, well knowing the disposition of the Parliament. Various harangues were afterwards delivered by the Reformers. Pym commenced the dark proceedings by an oration of two hours, which he divided into three heads, and reduced, like the sermons of the Puritans, to numerous subdivisions. Sir Benjamin Rudyard followed, and commented on "innovations in religion," and was followed in the same strain by other members. After appointing some other committees, they resorted to their usual expedient—a fast; thus prostituting that religion, which is long-suffering and gentleness, to cover their hypocrisy, and those designs which they had fostered, and contrived to promote.

[1] Rushworth, Part iii. vol. i. p. 14, 15, 16.

The Archbishop had long been aware that his ruin was determined; but the first decided intimation was given in the speech of Sir Edward Dering, his bitter enemy, who hoped "by the help of the House, that before the year terminated, his Grace would either have more grace, or no grace at all; for our manifold griefs," said he, "do fill a mighty and vast circumference, yet so, that from every part our lives of sorrow do lead to him, and point at him the centre, whence our miseries in this Church, and many of them in the Commonwealth, do flow." But this was a matter which required their cautious dexterity, and, therefore, as a prelude to their designs for destroying the King's ministers, they entered upon a business "which may be regarded," says Hume, "as decisive."

This was the impeachment of the Earl of Strafford. That distinguished statesman had made himself peculiarly obnoxious to the faction by his loyalty. By an unfortunate combination, he was beheld by the three nations at once as a capital enemy. So implacable were the Scots against him, that they had actually refused to send commissioners to treat with the King at York, because they saw him lieutenant-general of the royal forces. For eight years he had governed Ireland with boldness, prudence, and activity; he had repressed numerous disorders in that turbulent kingdom; he had compelled the Scots of Ulster to renounce their idol, the Covenant; he had proclaimed the Covenanters rebels and traitors; and, by his indefatigable exertions, had sus-

tained the dignity of the crown at the hazard of his life. He had been urged by the King to appear in Parliament much against his inclinations; and he was only persuaded by the repeated entreaties of his royal master, who declared to him, that he was able to protect him from danger, and that the Parliament should not touch a hair of his head.

The faction had been long sensible of Strafford's abilities, and this made its leaders declare, that if they could persuade the King to part with him, he would deny them nothing. Accordingly, on the 11th of November, a concerted attack was made against him in the House of Commons by Pym, as soon as his arrival in London was known. The debate was carried on with closed doors, nor would they admit a messenger from the Peers, because they were at that time, they said, employed in the agitation of weighty and important business; and it was finally moved, that Lord Digby, Sir John Clotworthy, Sir Walter Erle, Pym, St. John, Strode, Grimston, and Hampden, be appointed a committee to prepare his impeachment in the House of Lords.

In the mean time they continued their practices against the Archbishop. Secretary Windebanke was accused, and he probably saved his life by flight. Sir George Radcliffe was committed to prison, and numerous clergymen, among whom was Heylin, were severally served with articles of impeachment. Nor was the Lord Keeper Finch forgotten. He was impeached of high treason, and, perhaps, escaped the block by a timely retreat to Holland.

At the appointment of a sub-committee for religion, Sir Edward Dering again commenced a furious harangue against the Archbishop, in which he was followed by Sir John Wray [1]. But the indications of the Archbishop's ruin were farther evident from Strafford's fate. No sooner had that nobleman been introduced into the House of Peers and taken his seat, than Pym carried up the impeachment to the Lords, and Strafford, unprepared for this speedy prosecution, was immediately ordered into custody.

Having thus secured Strafford, their attention was next directed to the Archbishop, first, to prohibit him from the King's councils, then to confine him to his diocese, and lastly, to deprive him of his authority. Five days after the committal of Strafford, the Archbishop's old enemy, the Bishop of Lincoln, not long afterwards promoted to the Archbishopric of York, was released from the Tower, and restored to his place in the House of Peers, at the secret instigation of the faction, who imagined they would find in him an able auxiliary. Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick were also recalled from exile. Those incendiaries entered London amidst the applauses of thousands, who, in the height of their seditious zeal, celebrated this inflammatory triumph by bitter exclamations against the Bishops for so unmercifully persecuting those godly men!

On the 4th of December the Archbishop was ex-

[1] Nalson, vol. i. p. 538—540. Rushworth, Part iii. vol. i. p. 55, 56.

amined in Strafford's case, who had by this time been committed to the Tower. A motion had been previously made, that no bishops should have any vote in the present case, under the pretence that, by virtue of their office, as is set forth in some ancient canons, they were prohibited, because it was *in causa sanguinis*. This was a crafty expedient, and sufficiently indicated the contrivances of the faction; for though the prelates, by asserting their peerage, were under no such restraint, and though they were entitled, as spiritual peers, to judge in all civil cases which came before the House of Lords, yet the incendiaries were uncertain as to the issue of these proceedings if their votes were allowed. Moreover, they had matured a bill both against bishops, and their right to seats in the Upper House; thereby manifestly setting the law of England at defiance, and rendering all preceding parliaments illegal; for nothing can be more evident than the position, that if an individual votes on any question when he is not qualified, although the act passes into a law, still that law is abrogated, by the disqualification of the voter. Here then was a most cunning expedient. It at once declared all the former parliaments of England to be illegal, because there never had been a parliament in which the bishops did not sit, their seats being as legal and fundamental as those of the lords temporal; an abrogation, in short, of the great Charter of English liberty, which has made the summoning of the spiritual peers inseparable from the constitution of the

monarchy, and the privileges of the Upper House. But this scheme could not be managed at once, and therefore the seditious reformers thought it more advisable to commence with these exceptions, which, if they received the King's consent, as in this case they did, would pave the way for the accomplishment of their ultimate designs.

But while they were thus aiming their deadly blows at the foundation of the monarchy, though ostensibly against Strafford and Laud, and setting forth their cant and hypocrisy in a paper entitled, "A Particular of the manifold evils, pressures, grievances, carried, practised, and occasioned by the prelates and their dependents[1]," on the 14th of December and two following days, they began to debate on the late Convocation and Canons; and their harangues were expressed in language abounding with more than ordinary violence. On the 16th, these were condemned as contrary to the laws of the constitution, "the rights of Parliament, the property and liberty of the subject," and as containing "matters tending to sedition, and of dangerous consequence." On this occasion a committee was appointed to consider and examine who were the promoters of the new canons, and who the principal actors; "and to consider, in particular, how far the Archbishop of Canterbury hath been an actor in all the proceedings of them, and in the great design of

[1] Nalson's Collections, vol. i. p. 164, 665. (the pages here are erroneously numbered). Rushworth, Par iii. vol. i. p. 93—96.

the subversion of the laws of the realm, and of the religion; and to prepare and to draw up a charge against him and such others as shall appear offenders [1]."

The venerable Primate's fate was now decided; as indeed it had been previously concerted with that of Strafford. This committee was to inquire into all his actions, he was held to be the author of the Canons, and a "subverter of religion." Here, in the first instance, there was manifest injury done him, because every individual of the Convocation, whose signature was affixed, was as criminal (if crime there was) as the Archbishop; and, secondly, the sages who composed this committee were his professed enemies, who had previously ascribed to him the whole odium of the Canons, and, consequently, incapable of judging with impartiality. It is alleged by Heylin, that at first his enemies designed nothing farther than to confine him to his diocese, to prohibit him from attending the royal councils, that they aimed not at his life but at his removal; and the Archbishop seems to have been so persuaded, as he himself informed that writer [2]. I confess I cannot agree with this opinion. For when we consider all the injurious libels circulated against him, the speeches of the members of this Parliament, in which their dark practices were fully indicated, the remark of Prynne in the Tower, that the Archbishop

[1] Nalson, vol. i. p. 679, 680. Rushworth, ut sup. p. 100—113. Diary, p. 59, 60. Heylin, p. 434, 435.

[2] Heylin, p. 435.

would yet be a prisoner in that very place, which he hoped to see,—in short, the motion of some, at the appointment of this committee, to have the Archbishop impeached without any further ceremony, doubtless anticipating that he would accompany Strafford to the scaffold; I cannot help being persuaded, that his death had been determined, and that these were only gradual steps towards its accomplishment [1].

This appears farther evident from the fact, that on this very day the Archbishop was impeached by the Scottish Commissioners in the House of Lords as an incendiary, in the prelude to their false and hypocritical paper, entitled, "The Charge of the Scottish Commissioners against the Prelate of Canterbury." This paper, as I have already said, is answered in every paragraph by the venerable Primate himself, in the affecting "History of his own Troubles and Trials [2]," and therefore I need not enlarge upon it; suffice it to say, that "the novations in religion," according to those enthusiasts, were, "1. Some particular alterations in matters of religion, pressed upon us without order, and against law, contrary to the forms established in our Kirk. 2. A new book of Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical. 3. A Liturgy, or Book of Common Prayer, which did also carry many dangerous errors in matters of doctrine; with all which we challenge the Prelate of

[1] Nalson, vol. i. p. 630. [2] History, ut sup. 87—143.

Canterbury as the prime cause on earth [1]." Could it be possible that the faction in the Commons knew nothing of this charge, or when it was to be made? Had they no conversation with the Commissioners? Did they proceed to the Upper House of their own accord, without informing their partisans of their intentions? Nay, it is beyond a doubt, since the charge was produced in *writing*, that it was previously concerted amongst them, because it contains a singular mixture of Puritan and Covenanting zeal. I maintain that the charge was *not written in Scotland;* and that the fanatics wished to involve the Archbishop in Strafford's ruin. This is evident from the fact, that these commissioners on that very day exhibited a charge against the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, asserting in the outset, that "in these declarations they had joined with Canterbury the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, whose malice had set all his arts and power to work, to devise and to do mischief to their Kirk and country;" and also, because the members of the committee employed to impeach the Archbishop were enjoined "to have power to send for parties, witnesses, papers, books, records, and to do *any other act* which they in their judgment shall think best to conduce to the business [2]."

While engaged in these dark practices, St. An-

[1] Published at London, 4to. 1641. Nalson, vol. i. p. 681—686. Rushworth, Part iii. vol. i. p. 113—119.

[2] Rushworth, Part iii. vol. i. p. 113. Nalson, vol. i. p. 686—688

toline's church in London was given to the Scottish Commissioners for the exercise of their Presbyterian rites, and multitudes of fanatics resorted thither to be instructed in the cant and enthusiasm of the Covenanters. Two puritanical ministers preached seven hours before the House of Commons. One of them, Burgess, from the text, (Jer. l. 5.) "They shall ask the way to Zion with their faces thitherward, saying, Come, let us join ourselves to the Lord by a perpetual *covenant*." The altar of St. Margaret's, Westminster, was removed to the centre of the church; the communion service interrupted by psalm-singing; the phrase, spiritual lords, was omitted in Acts of Parliament; the clerk of the Upper House turned his back on the Bishops when reading bills; the temporal peers took precedence of the spiritual; the regular clergy were insulted in the public streets by mobs of incendiaries; and the Liturgy, in their language, was termed *quenching the demonstrations of the Spirit;* furious Puritanism predominated—a crisis was at hand.

While the Scottish Commissioners exhibited in the Upper House their pretended "Charge" against the venerable Primate, whose hairs had grown grey in the service of his Sovereign, their allies, who were employed in drawing up the impeachment in the Commons, were not the less indefatigable in their share of the plot. Prynne and his associates employed all their influence to inflame the people against the Church, that incendiary circulating about the city all kinds of libels and ballads, abound-

ing with scurrility against the Bishops, and especially against the Archbishop. The rhetoric of the reformers in Parliament was not less inflammatory, abounding in all manner of falsehood, invective, and abuse. On the 18th of December, a debate took place on the Archbishop's conduct; the plot being now fully matured between the Covenanters and the Puritans. On that occasion, the very anniversary of the day on which the Primate was consecrated to his first bishopric of St. David's, Harbottle Grimston, one of the members for Colchester, offered his *reasons* why they should proceed a little farther against the Archbishop than a *bare sequestration,* "take up a resolution to do somewhat," and "strike while the iron is hot."—"Mr. Speaker," said the enthusiast, "long introductions are not suitable to weighty affairs. We are now fallen on that great man, the Archbishop of Canterbury; look upon him as he is in his highness, and he is the stye of all pestilential filth that hath infected the state and government of this Commonwealth. Look upon him in his dependencies, and he is the man, the only man, that hath raised and advanced all those that, together with himself, have been the authors and causes of all our ruins, miseries, and calamities, we now groan under. Who else but he only that hath brought the Earl of Strafford to all his great places and employments?—a fit spirit and instrument to act and execute his wicked and bloody designs in these kingdoms. Who is it but he only that brought Secretary Windebanke into this

place of service of trust, the very broker and pander of the whore of Babylon? Who is it, Mr. Speaker, but he only that hath advanced all our Popish Bishops? I shall name but some of them, Bishop Manwaring, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Bishop of Oxford, and Bishop Wren, the last of all those birds, but one of the most unclean ones? These are the men that should have fed Christ's flock, but they are the wolves that have devoured them: the sheep should have fed upon the mountains, but the mountains have eaten up the sheep. It was the happiness of our Church, when the zeal of God's house ate up the bishops, glorious and brave martyrs, that went to the stake in defence of the Protestant religion; but the zeal of the bishops has only been to persecute and eat up the Church. Who is it, Mr. Speaker, but this great Archbishop of Canterbury, that hath sitten at the helm, to steer and to manage all the projects that have been set on foot in this kingdom these ten years past, and, rather than he would stand out, he hath most unworthily kicked and chaffered in the meanest of them, as, for instance, that of tobacco, wherein thousands of poor people have been stripped and turned out of the trades, for which they have served as apprentices; we all know he was the compounder and contractor with them for the licences, putting them to pay fines, and a fee farm rent to use their trade. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, he might have spent his time much better, and more for his Grace,

in the pulpit, than thus sharking and raking in the tobacco shops. Mr. Speaker, we all know what he hath been charged with here in this House, crimes of a dangerous consequence, and of a transcendent nature, no less than the subversion of the government of this kingdom, and the alteration of the Protestant religion; and this is not upon bare information only, but much of it is come before us already upon clear and manifest proofs, and there is scarce any grievance or complaint come before us in this place, wherein we do not find him mentioned, and as it were twined with it; like a busy angry wasp, his sting is in the tail of every thing. We have likewise this day heard the report of the conference yesterday, and in it the accusation of the Scottish nation, and we do all know he is guilty of the same, if not more, here in this kingdom[1]."

In this specimen of the oratory of those politicians, the language is deplorable, the charges false, the invective low, and altogether unworthy to be heard in the English House of Commons. The sophistry, too, is most remarkable, for it is evident that this enthusiast had already, in common with his associates, prejudged the Archbishop. It was a mere mockery to bring him afterwards to trial: he was already condemned; such a speech from a judge, in his charge to the jury, even after the

[1] Nalson, vol. i. p. 690, 691. Rushworth, Part iii. vol. i. p. 122, 123.

criminal has been convicted on the clearest evidence, would have been unjustifiable ; much more as composing part of a debate for the mere investigation of a man's actions. If it be one of the most distinguished attributes of British law, that every man, against whom an information is lodged, is presumed to be innocent (at least there being only presumptive evidence of his guilt) until he be fairly and legally convicted by his country, then it is clear, granting for a moment that their falsehood holds of the Primate's crimes, that he was only presumed to be guilty until he was legally tried and convicted by his peers. This, however, formed no part of Puritan justice. They said he was guilty, they condemned him, and then, by a singular absurdity, they proceeded to impeach him. It is easy, indeed, to triumph over misfortune: the coward exults over a fallen enemy.

On this day, therefore, the House of Commons voted the Archbishop a traitor, and Denzil Holles, second son to the Earl of Clare, and brother-in-law to the Earl of Strafford, (with whose impeachment, however, he would have no concern,) carried up to the House of Lords the order for the Primate's committal. The members of that House were of course prepared. Holles assured the Peers that the impeachment would be proved in due time, and demanded that the Archbishop should be sequestrated, and committed to custody. The Scottish Commissioners then produced their pretended "charges," and he

was immediately committed to the custody of Maxwell, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod [1].

The Primate was now called to the bar of the House as a criminal, but the intrepidity of conscious innocence did not forsake him. He merely desired permission to proceed to Lambeth, and prepare his defence from his papers. This was granted, under the conditions that it should be done in the afternoon, in presence of the Gentleman Usher, and that he should return to his custody that night; and in the mean time the House decided, that no member should visit the Archbishop without its permission. He stayed at Lambeth, he informs us, till the evening, to avoid the vulgar gaze, and went to evening prayers in his own chapel. "The Psalms of the day," says this venerable prelate, "Psalms xciii. and xciv. and the fiftieth chapter of Isaiah, gave me great comfort. God make me worthy of it, and fit to receive it." When he proceeded to his barge in the evening, he was met by hundreds of his "poor neighbours," who had often experienced his bounty, who with sorrowful hearts witnessed his misfortunes, and invoked Heaven for his safety and speedy return to the Palace [2].

Having thus secured the Archbishop and Strafford, the enemies of the former now proceeded to

[1] Rushworth, Part iii. vol. i. p. 123. Nalson, vol. i. p. 691. Diary, p. 60. Troubles and Trials, p. 86. 144. Canterburie's Doome, p. 22.

[2] Diary, p. 60.

disclose their vengeance. "The tender mercies," says the Psalmist, "of the wicked are cruel:" and a fine inflicted on the Primate shews the truth of the inspired adage. Sir John Villiers, eldest brother to the Duke of Buckingham, had married, as his second wife, Elizabeth, daughter of Sir William Slingsby, of Yorkshire; but she commenced a criminal intercourse with Sir Robert Howard, fifth son of the Earl of Suffolk, to whom she bore a child, during her husband's illness, under the assumed name of Mrs. Wright, in a retired house. The criminal intercourse transpired, and the guilty lady was brought into the High Commission. In that Court, on the 19th of December, 1627, she was found guilty of adultery, and sentenced to do penance at St. Paul's Cross. Although the Archbishop suffered the whole odium of this just sentence, yet there were present and concurred in it, besides the Archbishop, who was then Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Lord Keeper Coventry, the Earl of Manchester, Lord President, the Earls of Pembroke, Montgomery, and Dorset, Lord Viscount Grandison, the Bishops of London, Durham, Norwich, Rochester, Secretary Cook, Sir Henry Martin, Dr. Donne, Dean of St. Paul's, Balcanquall, Dean of Rochester, and four others. The lady, however, contrived to escape, and, after the storm was over, her paramour conveyed her to Shropshire, where they openly cohabited, and had several children. At length, they presumed to reside in Lon-

don, and Howard lodged her in Westminster, not far from the palace. This of course was no secret. "The King and the Lords," says the Archbishop, "took notice of it, as a thing full of impudence, that they should so publicly adventure to outface the justice of the realm in so foul a business." One day the Archbishop waited on the King, when the Monarch informed him of the affair, and wondered that he did not perform his duty, and apprehend the guilty pair. The Archbishop replied, that the lady was the wife of a peer of the realm, and that without the royal authority he could not proceed, but that, since he knew the King's pleasure, he would endeavour to apprehend her. He was successful: the lady and her paramour were both taken; the former imprisoned in the Gatehouse, the latter in the Fleet. She was ordered to do penance on the second Sunday after; but Howard effected her escape to France in man's apparel. Next day he was ordered by the High Commission to remain in confinement, in which he continued for a few months. It may be supposed that he bore an implacable hatred towards the Primate, and accordingly, on the 21st of December, 1640, he brought an action against him for false imprisonment; upon which the House of Lords condemned him to pay a fine of 500*l.* and Sir John Lamb and Sir Henry Martin 250*l.* each, to the said Howard; and with such rigour was it exacted, that the Archbishop was compelled to sell his plate to

discharge it, he having only two days allowed to make payment [1].

After a session of two months, in which the parliamentary zealots had prepared to sacrifice their victims, the Commons adjourned for ten days, at the end of the year. During this period the Archbishop was in the custody of Maxwell, obliged to defray his own expences, and here he was confined for ten weeks, at the rate of twenty nobles a day, which in that space amounted to 466*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* before any specific charge was brought against him. Nay, so little regard had his enemies for his great age and debilitated body, that he was compelled to petition them for permission to enjoy the benefit of fresh air daily, while in this confinement. Yet his patience and meekness seem to have had some effect on his enemies, for he received information from a member of the Committee, that the House of Lords was so well pleased with his moderate behaviour, that there were considerable indications of favour towards him. "I was glad," says he, "to hear of any favour, considering the times, but considering my innocence, I did not hold this for favour. And I could not but observe to myself what justice I was to expect, since here was a resolution taken among the leading men in the House, what censure should be laid upon me, be-

[1] Heylin, p. 251, 252. Diary, p. 60. Troubles and Trials, p. 145—147.

fore any charge, so much as a general one, was brought up against me[1]."

The zealots, however, were in the meanwhile busy with the articles of the Archbishop's impeachment. On the 26th of February, 1640-1, these articles, to the number of fourteen, were carried up to the House of Lords from the Commons by the notorious Sir Henry Vane the younger, successively a Presbyterian, Independent, Anabaptist, Fifth Monarchy Man, and always an enthusiast, who was himself overtaken by justice after the Restoration, and beheaded on Tower-hill, and on the very spot where those illustrious men suffered in whose condemnation he was so actively concerned. Rushworth affirms, that the articles were carried up by Pym, Hampden, and Maynard, and he inserts Pym's speech at the presenting of them[2]. It is probable that they accompanied Vane, who was the principal person[3]. Pym's speech, after his usual manner, contains a comment on every article; and they concluded the articles by craving time to prove all the charges, entreating that the Archbishop might still be kept in safe custody[4].

As a specimen of the justice of Laud's accusers, it may be proper to mention, that the deliberation

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 147. Diary, p. 60.

[2] Rushworth, Part iii. vol. i. p. 195—202. Canterburie's Doome, p. 23, 24.

[3] Diary, p. 60, 61.

[4] Rushworth, ut sup.

for his impeachment did not occupy half an hour. As soon as the articles were exhibited, he was ordered to attend the House, when they were severally read to him at the Bar. The aged prelate rejected the charge of treason with indignation. Advancing forward, and drawing up his bending and emaciated body, he fixed his eyes on the House, and craved permission to address them. This was granted, and he then proceeded: "My Lords, this is a great and a heavy charge, and if it be proved against me, I am unworthy to live: for it makes me against God in point of religion, against the King in point of allegiance, and against the public in point of safety, under the justice and protection of law. And though the King be hardly, if at all, mentioned, yet I am bold to name him, because I have ever been of opinion that the King and his people are so joined together in one civil and politic body, as that it is impossible for any man to be true to the King as King, who shall be found treacherous to the State established by law, and to the subversion of the people, though, perhaps, every one that is so, is not able to see through all the consequences by which one depends upon the other. So my charge, my Lords, is exceeding heavy in itself, though I as yet do not altogether feel its weight: for it is yet, as your Lordships see, only general; and general assertions may make a great noise, but are no proofs; whereas, it is the proof upon particulars that makes a charge heavy against any man. My Lords, it is an old and a true rule, *Errare contin-*

git descendendo, error doth most often happen, and best appear, when men descend to particulars; and when I shall be charged with them, I hope my innocence will furnish me with a sufficient answer to any error of mine that shall be thought criminal, or worthy the cognisance of this high and honourable Court. As for human frailties, since I cannot acquit myself of them, so I presume your Lordships will be favourable judges: since in the transaction of all the business which passed my hands, men, abler than ever I can be, have been subject to them, to as many and as great. But for corruption, in the least degree, I humbly praise my God for it, I fear no accuser who will speak the truth. Yet, my Lords, that which goes nearest unto me among these articles is, that I should be thought foul and false in the profession of my religion, as if I should profess with the Church of England, and have my heart at Rome, and labour by all cunning ways to bring Romish superstitions upon the kingdom. This, my Lords, I confess, troubles me exceedingly, and if I should forget myself and grow warm upon it, I should only be in the case in which St. Jerome confessed he was, when he knew not how to be patient under the charge of falsehood in religion. And yet that is nothing to the charge which is brought against me, not only as basely false myself, but as labouring withal to spread the same falsehood over the whole kingdom."

Thus did this noble prelate repel, with virtuous

indignation, the falsehoods of his accusers, and, in a style of impassioned eloquence, excite the blush of shame in those who thirsted for his blood. He could endure the other charge, at least in conscious innocence he trusted to a patient investigation; but when his religion was questioned, when termed an impostor and deluder, like the holy martyrs and fathers of old, he disclaimed the wicked insinuation. This was the unkindest charge of all: this was what pierced his very soul. He, whose monuments of piety and munificence were many and noble,—whose pen had produced the most masterly production of modern times in defence of the Reformation, compared to which the canting and fanatical productions of Puritans and Covenanters sink into insignificance—whose life had been an unwearied round of toil and anxiety to guard against superstition and infidelity in the Church,—to be thus vilely and falsely slandered before his country by hypocrites, demagogues, republicans, and schismatics. Can we wonder that his virtuous soul repelled the foul charge with warm indignation? It was the impulse of a noble mind. For what character can be more despicable, what heart more depraved, than his, who is insincere in his religion, or who has no religion at all? And the man without religion, like the historian who professes to be without country, without party, without friends, is the most hollow and heartless of mortals. Be he who he may, such a man is reckoned vile by the vilest of men. And how much more so the minister of its holy

mysteries, who assumes it as a means of gratifying his worldly ambition, or of accomplishing his intrigues, while he either disbelieves it altogether, or feels nothing of its animating power? For the want of religion no accomplishment or intellectual greatness can compensate—but the hypocrite in religion commits an outrage on society, which, when discovered, will make him the object of merited execration.

It is needless here to recapitulate the articles exhibited against the Archbishop; suffice it to say, that he was charged as being the sole cause of all those evils which afflicted the kingdom, although in reality they were justly chargeable on the Puritan faction. These fourteen articles he has separately answered in the affecting history of his "Troubles and Trials," and with inimitable eloquence and clearness. In reply to the first charge, that "he hath traitorously endeavoured to subvert the fundamental laws and government of the kingdom, and instead thereof to introduce an arbitrary and tyrannical government," he distinctly declared the fallacy of the whole. At the Council Table he had invariably followed the opinions of the great lawyers who had there a seat; for the truth of which he appealed to the learned counsel who had conducted the cases of their clients. He denied that he had advised the King to levy money at his own pleasure from the subject, but he admitted, that, "howsoever it stands by the law of God, for a King, in the just and necessary defence of himself and his kingdom, to levy

money from his subjects, yet, where a particular national law doth intervene in any kingdom, and is settled by mutual consent between the King and his people, their money ought to be levied by and according to law." He demanded to know what his enemies meant by the fundamental laws of England, which they pretended he had subverted, and about which they clamoured so violently; he said these ought to be known to all men, that they might see their danger, and subvert them at their peril. But it was not so; at that time the laws of England had no text at all; many celebrated lawyers could not exactly define what the law was; by which, as the Archbishop remarked, the judges had liberty to retain more of it *in scrinio pectoris* than was fitting. In every other government, he said, there was a text—a *corpus juris*, written and laid down, save in England; and yet the same punishment was to be awarded to a man who had unconsciously offended, as if the law had been regularly embodied. In such a case, it was clear that prejudiced judges could make any thing law at the moment; there was no restraint upon them; and hence, if they chose to consider certain actions unconstitutional, they must be so, whether they were really so or not. And he recommended, that it would be worthy of Parliament to make a digest of the common law, to submit it to the opinions of the judges, and to ratify it by a solemn act as fundamental, and then, said he, let any man subvert the laws at his peril.

But the venerable Primate's reply was most volu-

minous to the tenth charge, which pretended that he had traitorously and wickedly endeavoured to reconcile the Church of England to that of Rome. This he distinctly denied, which he proved in nine divisions. He appealed to the book which he had written against the Jesuit, which, he said, must either acquit him of this calumny, or prove him a villain to the world. He appealed to those whom he had restrained from recanting to the Romish Church; to the hatred which the Recusants in England and abroad bore towards him; to his great age, great, considering the active life he had led; to the ease with which he could have ensured popular favour, which, he said, he disdained, because he held it to be the utmost baseness to frame religion to serve turns, "to be carried about with every wind of vain doctrine, to serve and please other men's fancies, and not a man's own understanding and conscience." He thus speaks: "I think the greatest enemies I have are of opinion, that, had I turned to the Romish party, especially if I had been such a champion for them as this article sets forth, I would not only have been welcomed but rewarded by them; at least, I would have lived in credit, if not in honour. This being granted, fain would I know what could stay me here, save my conscience and the truth. Surely not a concern for wife and children, for I have them not; and since this calamity has overtaken me, I most humbly and heartily bless my God, that I have not any of these to increase my misery. Not the *greatness* of my place, for if in

this present fall, any thing be put either upon it or me that a knowing conscience ought to check, the world shall soon see how little I value Canterbury when my conscience is at stake[1]. Nor yet the *honour* of my place, for if I stood upon that, well do I know how malice hath laid it in the dust, or lower, if that can be. Who can conceive that I would endure so much hatred, and so many base libels, as have filled the streets against me, and such bitter revilings in print, as the gall of some pens have cast upon me, when I might elsewhere go, and live with content and reputation? Nothing but conscience could stay me here in this condition. Nor yet the *wealth* to be got in my place, for the archbishopric of Canterbury is very far short of its alleged value, as I have given a faithful account to my sovereign. But were it never so wealthy in revenues, every benefit, over and above my necessary and decent expences, I have refunded back upon the poor, the public, or the Church whence I had it, as churchmen in better times than these were wont to do. Here, then, could be no external motive to induce me to remain here, save my conscience; and my conscience not being that way set, no man can so much as think that I would, at the hazard of my life, my honour, and all that I hold dear, practise the change of religion, and that against my conscience. But hard am I beset. The Pope's agent

[1] The Archbishop alludes to the report that he was to be confined to his Diocese.

(as it is said) plots my death, on the one hand [1], because I will not be induced to aid and countenance the Romish superstition; and the Parliament, on the other, attempts to overthrow me, pretending that I am in league to introduce the superstition. So that I am in the prophet David's case. 'For I also have heard the blasphemy of the multitude, and fear is on every side, while they conspire together against me, and take their counsel to take away my life. But my hope hath been, and is, in thee, O Lord [2].'"

The Primate then demanded a trial, but it was not the purpose of his enemies to satisfy him so soon; and accordingly, on the first of March, 1640-1, he was committed to the Tower. He was carried thither by Maxwell, in that officer's own coach. He wished to go thither in the evening, to avoid the gaze of the populace, but Maxwell's duties would not permit him to comply, and he was conveyed in the forenoon, when the citizens were at dinner, that being thought the fittest time for privacy. From Maxwell's house, which was at Charing Cross, he proceeded to Cheapside unmolested, but there an individual discovered him, ("one apprentice," says he, "first hallooed out") and raised the fanatical outcry, so that by the time he got to the Exchange, the rabble had increased to a great assemblage. They fol-

[1] Alluding to the plot, (real or pretended,) made known by Andreas ab Harnenfield, and communicated by Sir William Boswell, ambassador at the Hague.

[2] Troubles and Trials, p. 160—163.

lowed him with their insults and reproaches to the gates of the Tower, to the grief of Maxwell, who respected the fallen primate. Thus it is always with the mob; the sons of Shimei with savage ferocity delight to see greatness in distress; their dastardly incendiaries feed the flame. But who can trust to their vile passions? The man who is to-day the idol of popular applause, whose praise is in the mouth of every political fanatic, may to-morrow be led out to execution amid the groans, revilings, and execrations of the same ignorant and perverted rabble.

After the committal of the Archbishop to the Tower, where already was the illustrious and loyal Strafford, his enemies expressed their hatred without restraint. Numerous libels and ballads against him were circulated in London and Westminster; they were even thrust into the hands of the members at the door of the House of Commons with marks of approbation; abusive pictures were also exhibited, characteristic of sectarian invective and abuse. The Puritan fanatics, headed by Prynne, who with the other incendiaries, Burton and Bastwick, instead of being tamed by their rigorous punishments, showed an anxiety to repeat their offences, commenced the sectarian revenge; all the seditious poetasters in the kingdom sent forth their contemptible effusions. "The pulpits," says Mr. Hume, "delivered over to puritanical preachers and lecturers, whom the Commons arbitrarily settled in all the considerable churches, resounded with faction and fanaticism.

Vengeance was fully taken for that long silence and restraint, in which, by the authority of Laud and the High Commission, these preachers had been retained. The press, freed from all fears or reserve, swarmed with productions, dangerous by their seditious zeal and calumny, more than by any art or eloquence of composition. Noise and fury, cant and hypocrisy, formed the sole rhetoric, which during this tumult of various prejudices and passions could be heard or attended to[1]."

To enumerate the productions of Puritan hatred and fanaticism against the Archbishop would be almost impossible. Yet, as a specimen, I may mention a few which I have seen. Prynne, as has been said, was busy in the work. This year he edified the enthusiasts with "A new Discovery of the Prelates' Tyranny." Burton preached and published what he calls "A most godly Sermon preached at St. Alban's," 4to. "The Sounding of the Two last Trumpets, the sixth and seventh," 4to. "England's Bondage and Hope of Deliverance, a Sermon," 4to. and "A Divine Tragedy lately acted." Bastwick thought proper to exhibit his "Confessions," in which he termed himself the most faithful witness of Jesus Christ. A poetaster set forth "An Answer to the most envious, scandalous, and libellous pamphlet, entitled, Mercure's Message, or a Letter sent to William Laud in the Tower," 4to. "All to Westminster, or news from Elysium," 4to. "Can-

[1] Hume, vol. vi. p. 377.

terburie's Will, with a serious Conference between his conscience and him," 4to. "A Parallel, or Briefe Comparison of the Liturgie with the Masse-Book," 4to. "Rome's A. B. C., being a short Perambulation or rather auricular accusation of a late tyrannical oppressor," 4to. "A Canterbury Tale, translated out of Chaucer's old English, whereunto is added, the Scots Pedlar," 4to. "Ladensium Autokatakria, the Canterburian's Self Conviction," 4to. This is intended as an answer to the Epistle Congratulatorie of Lysimachus Nicanor, who is described as a "prime Canterburian," and was published at Edinburgh, April 1, 1641, with the *imprimatur* of Archibald Johnston, clerk to the Covenanting Assembly, afterwards one of Cromwell's peers. "A large Supplement to the Canterburian Self-Conviction." "Rome for Canterbury, dedicated to all the Arminian Tribe, or Canterburian faction, in the yeare of grace, 1641." "Copy of a Letter sent to William Laud, late Archbishop of Canterbury, now prisoner in the Tower." "A new Play called Canterburie his Change of Diet." This singular pamphlet was written by a scribbler named Walker, who also produced two other fanatical effusions, entitled, "The Report of the Bishop of Canterburie's Dream," and "Canterburie's Pilgrimage, in the testimony of an accused conscience for the blood of Mr. Burton, Mr. Prynne, and Doctor Bastwicke." "The Bishop's Potion, or a Dialogue between the Bishop of Canterbury and his Physician." "A Second Message to William, Archbishop of

Canterburie, in behalf of Mercurie." "A Discovery of the notorious proceedings of W. Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, in bringing innovations into the Church." As might be expected, the friendship between the primate and Strafford afforded abundant cause for the enthusiasts to exercise their wit. Among other productions, after the murder of Strafford, appeared a poem in 4to. entitled, "The Discontented Conference between William, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the late Earl of Strafford."

These pamphlets, besides others which it is needless to enumerate, all appeared in 1641, after the Archbishop's committal to the Tower. His enemies now proceeded to the prelude of their crimes. In the months of March and April, the Archbishop, along with others who had given their votes in the Star Chamber, was ordered to make satisfaction and reparation to Prynne and the other incendiaries, for their sentence and imprisonment. Their sentences were all voted illegal, and Dr. Heylin was ordered to be impeached, "for promoting the suit in the Star Chamber against Prynne." Leighton's case was taken into consideration, and it may be here remarked, as a farther proof that the Archbishop was not concerned in this trial, that he is only mentioned as ordered to give satisfaction to that incendiary for "his damages sustained by fifteen weeks imprisonment in Newgate on the said Bishop's warrant." Burton was voted 6000*l.*, Bastwick and Prynne 5000*l.* each, out of the estates of the Archbishop

and the other commissioners—sums, however, which were never paid [1].

The injustice of the Archbishop's persecutors did not stop here. On the 27th of April, a bill was read a second time in the Commons, "for punishing and fining the Members of the late Convocation of the province of Canterbury." By this bill it was intended to fine the clergy of the Convocation 200,000*l.*, a sum which exceeded the value of their whole estates. The Archbishop was fined 20,000*l.* the *deceased* Archbishop of York (Neile), 10,000*l.*, Bishop Wren, 10,000*l.*, towards whom those enthusiasts had a peculiar antipathy, the Bishop of Chester 3,000*l.* and the rest in proportion [2].

Such were a few of the proceedings of this tremendous popular tribunal, which exercised a tyranny and a despotism far exceeding the proceedings of the most complete absolute monarch. Strafford and Archbishop Laud, the two most powerful ministers of the King cast into prison, while no protection could be afforded them by their sovereign; the Lord Keeper Finch, and Secretary Windebank, compelled to avoid a similar fate by flight; the Bishop of Ely, Dr. Cozens, Dean of Peterborough, Dr. Heylin, and other clergymen attacked on account of pretended innovations; every person, in short, who had distinguished himself for his loyalty, was visited with an impeachment or imprisonment.

[1] Nalson, vol. i. p. 780. 783. 788. 794. 798, 799, 800.

[2] Nalson, vol. i. p. 806, 807. Rushworth, vol. iv. p. 35. 235.

A jurisdiction was erected which assumed the most unwarrantable powers; a tribunal, determined to fortify itself by terror, to make its opposers tremble, and to establish itself by overthrowing the constitution. The King was compelled to remain passive under these violent proceedings; his faithful servants were filled with fear and astonishment. The Scots were voted 300,000*l.* and were honoured with the title of brethren. A petition was presented to the House for an alteration in church government by Alderman Pennington, the city member, from London, to which it was pretended 15,000 signatures were annexed. This was the famous Root and Branch Petition, which Archbishop Usher attacked in a tract, proving the apostolical institution of Episcopacy, from Ignatius, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and other Fathers[1]. It was rejected, indeed, in the Upper House, but was soon succeeded by a bill for the total abolition of Episcopacy. Thus did Puritanical Calvinism triumph. The same spirit which doomed the mild though mistaken Servetus to the flames, now animated these zealots with a sway only the more severe; schism, sedition, rebellion, the offspring of Calvinism, walked lovingly together over the kingdom, and accelerated the deeds of murder and blood which the Puritan enthusiasts were destined to commit; and to fill the measure of their guilt by that most horrible of all crimes—laying their hands on the sacred person of their King.

[1] Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 808.

CHAPTER XXI.

1641.

Trial of Strafford—His execution—Conduct of the Archbishop—He resigns the Chancellorship of Oxford—Persecution of the Archbishop by the Commons—Hypocrisy of the Sectaries—They excite tumults against the Clergy—Misfortunes of the Archbishop—He is insulted in the Tower Chapel—Plunder of Lambeth Palace—Injustice of his enemies—Motions for his banishment overruled—Orders of the Commons—Imprudent conduct of the King—His mortifications—Arrival of the Scottish army—Meeting of the Westminster Assembly of Divines—Persecutions by the Covenanters—Natural intolerance of the Presbyterians—Their enmity to Toleration—Their persecution of the Independents—Triumph of the Sectaries—Their hatred to the Fine Arts—They profane Cathedrals and Churches—Hardships of the Archbishop—Libels against him—Death of Hampden and Pym.

The commencement of this year is most remarkable for the trial and execution of Wentworth, Earl of Strafford. He and his friend the Archbishop had been singled out as especial objects of parliamentary vengeance: the latter, however, was reserved for a more convenient season. On the 22d of March, 1640-1, Strafford's trial began at Westminster.

The Committee employed to draw up the charge against this unfortunate nobleman, was vested, as

in the case of the Archbishop, with the most ample powers to examine, scrutinize, and investigate every part of the Earl's conduct and behaviour during his past life. The Committee, moreover, was composed of his implacable enemies. It was impossible, in this case, that either Strafford or Laud could escape, for, as Hume observes, "after so general and unbounded an inquisition, exercised by such powerful and implacable enemies, a man must have been very cautious, or very discreet, not to afford, during the whole course of his life, some matter of accusation against him." But it would appear that the zealots had a deeper design concealed. They distrusted, perhaps, their ability to prove any specific charges against Strafford, unless they made the term of his presumed treasonable proceedings indefinite: moreover, Strafford had the King's warrant in his pocket for every action of his Irish government, and they, therefore, could not condemn for high treason, unless the King disowned these warrants; hence the meaning of their expression, "that if they got the King to part with Strafford, he would deny them nothing."

A debate had taken place in the Upper House concerning the right of the Bishops to vote in criminal cases. Williams, Bishop of London, now liberated from the Tower, and reconciled to the King, had already signalised himself by seconding Lord Say's speech against his old antagonist Archbishop Laud in the House of Lords—thereby giving room to suspect that he rejoiced in the venc-

rable Primate's misfortunes. In this affair, however, he defended the right of the bishops, asserting that their seats in that House, during any proceedings, was according to the constitution; that all acts of the House were of no avail if the spiritual lords were prohibited from voting,—and that no act could be passed without their concurrent votes. But, at the same time, he declared, that their attendance in this case was merely optional; and he expressed himself willing, in the name of his brother prelates, to withdraw when that business came before the House. Here, indeed, was a singular inconsistency, first to assert a right, and then to deny it; and hence the truth of Clarendon's observation is undeniable, that this prelate had betrayed a fundamental right of the whole order, to the great prejudice of the King, and to the taking away the life of that person who could not otherwise have suffered. In truth, Williams' conduct, and the advice he gave the King to sign the warrant for Strafford's execution, plainly indicate that he secretly wished this friend of the Archbishop to be out of the way; and that it is more than probable that he secretly stimulated the Earl's enemies, and even assured them of the King's sanction.

Strafford was impeached, attainted, and condemned: the first extensive act of infamy which the Parliament committed. When we recollect that the committee of inquiry consisted of his personal enemies, that an oath of secresy was administered to them, which, as Hume justly remarks, "gave them

the appearance of conspirators more than ministers of justice,"—that his enemies had so contrived, that it was impossible for him to elude their vigilance, or even prepare his defence;—in short, when we recollect the many infamous proceedings in which those affected champions of liberty engaged before the noble Strafford became their victim, it is not possible to withhold a reprobation of that most atrocious and inhuman execution. Every one has heard, too, of the sophistry of Bishop Williams. He it was who persuaded the King to sign the warrant; otherwise Strafford had not suffered. "A king," said he to Charles, "has a public and a private conscience, and he might do that as a king for his public conscience, which militated against his private conscience as a man." This is despicable casuistry, unworthy to proceed from the lips of any man, still more unworthy to come from a Christian Bishop. Contrasted with Bishop Juxon, how does this ambitious theologian sink in our esteem! That venerable prelate advised the King, thereby giving a proof of the most heroical integrity, that "he ought to do nothing with an unsatisfied conscience upon any consideration in the world." Every one has heard, too, of Strafford's eloquent defence. Even Pym, implacable as he was, trembled before that noble victim to republican tyranny; and his enemies were compelled to do homage to his greatness.

On the fatal morning that Charles signed the warrant for Strafford's execution, he signed his own: at that very time he signed the bill for making

the Parliament perpetual. On the 12th of May, 1641, Strafford was led out to execution on Tower-hill, an illustrious martyr for Church and State, a victim to the implacable enmity of parliamentary zealots. He died as he lived, great in death as he had been in life; his conduct worthy of his illustrious name. Loyalty was his crime; his faithful attachment to his Sovereign the cause of his misfortunes. The night before his execution he desired to have an interview with his illustrious and venerable friend the Archbishop; but he was told by the Lieutenant of the Tower that this could not be granted without an order from the Parliament. "Sir," replied he to the Lieutenant, "you may hear what passes between us; it is not now a time for me to plot treason, or for him to plot heresy." The Lieutenant, however, said that he was prohibited, but entreated his Lordship to apply to the Parliament for an order. "No," he replied, "I have gotten my dispatch from them, and will trouble them no more; I am now petitioning a higher court, where neither partiality can be expected nor error feared. But, my Lord" continued this heroic nobleman, turning to Archbishop Usher, Primate of Ireland, who attended him on the occasion, "I will tell you what I would have spoken to my Lord of Canterbury. Desire the Archbishop to aid me by his prayers this night, and to give me his blessing when I go abroad to-morrow, and to be at his window, that when I pass, by my last farewell, I may give him thanks for this and all his other

former favours." Usher proceeded to the aged Primate's apartments, and delivered the message of his friend, and returned with this reply from the sorrowful Archbishop, that "in conscience he was bound to do the first, and in duty and obligation to the second; but he feared his weakness and grief would not lend him sight to behold his destruction." On the following morning, attended by Usher, and several persons of distinction, among whom was his brother, Sir George Wentworth, the noble Strafford was led out to execution. Approaching the Archbishop's prison in his progress, he stopped, and looking up, he did not perceive that beloved friend. "Yet," said he to the Lieutenant, "though I do not see the Archbishop, give me leave, I pray you, to do my last obeisance towards his room." The aged Primate, however, appeared at the casement, and with hands uplifted, while the tears rolled down his venerable cheeks, supplicated in behalf of the noble sufferer. Strafford was deeply affected, and, bowing to the ground, exclaimed, "Farewell, my Lord, may God protect your innocency." But the scene was too much for Laud, and, overcome with grief, he sunk upon the ground, "as if his soul," as it has been beautifully remarked, "would have forced a way to join that of the Earl in its passage to eternity." Yet, fearing that this might be deemed weakness, he afterwards observed, "That he hoped, by God's assistance and his own innocence, when he came to his own execution, (which he now daily expected,) that the world would per-

ceive he had been more sensible of Strafford's loss than of his own; and good reason, for that nobleman had done more service to the Church, not to mention the State, than either himself, or all the other churchmen put together."

Thus fell Strafford, whose head was struck off at one blow—a noble victim for his loyalty, and whose life had indeed been offered to him, if he would abjure the Church, and advise the King to abolish Episcopacy; but whose answer was, that he would not buy his life at so dear a rate. The French minister, Richelieu, well knew his abilities, and wondered at the folly of the English, "who would not allow the wisest head among them to remain upon its own shoulders." Like Laud, he fell a sacrifice to the practices of the Covenanting enthusiasts of Scotland, who saw their Presbyterian Covenant insecure while Strafford lived. Pym and Vane, however, were the principal contrivers of his death. "The speech which he made at his end," (says his friend and fellow-martyr,) "was a great testimony of his religion and piety, and was then printed; and in the judgment of those who were men of worth, and of those who were upon the scaffold, and saw him die, he made a patient, pious, and courageous end; insomuch that some doubted whether his death had more of the Roman or the Christian in it, it was so full of both: and notwithstanding this hard fate which fell upon him, he is dead with more honour than any of those will gain who thirsted for his

blood. Thus ended the wisest, the stoutest, and every way the ablest subject that this nation hath had these many years. The day was afterwards called by divers, *Homicidium Comitis Straffordiæ*, the day of the murder of Strafford; because, when malice itself could find no law to put him to death, they made a law on purpose for it. May God forgive all, and be merciful [1]!"

The Archbishop received himself a due share of the odium which the blood-thirsty zealots attached towards Strafford. "Before his death," says he in another place, "the libels came out thick, and very malicious against him: and all this to whet the malice that was against him, and make the people more desirous of his death. But no sooner had he gone to his rest, than the libellers, who during that time reviled him, fell upon me; and, no doubt, with the same intentions. And the libels and ballads against me, were frequently spread through the city, and sung up and down the streets. But, I thank God for it, they were as full of falsehood as of gall. Besides, they made pictures of me, putting me into a cage, and fastening me to a post, by a chain at my shoulders, and the like. And divers of these libels made men sport in taverns and alehouses, where too many were as drunk with malice, as with the liquor they sucked in. Against which my only comfort was, that I had fallen into

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 178.

the same case with the prophet David, Psal. lxix. 'For they that sat in the gate spake against me, and I was the song of the drunkard.'"

The Primate's confinement was rendered more severe by his emaciated and debilitated state of body. He had never, indeed, been robust, and the severe illness to which he had been frequently subject in his infancy, had left in his frame the seeds of feebleness and disease. He was several times afflicted with the ague whilst in prison, occasioned, doubtless, by the rigour of his confinement, in his advanced age. Yet, in the midst of his "Troubles and Trials," he still preserved that magnanimity for which he had always been distinguished, expressing his trust and confidence in the Divine Protection, and the innocence of his cause.

We find the Archbishop, however, nobly preparing himself to encounter the vengeance of his enemies. He had, indeed, distinctly intimated that such would be his fate when he saw Strafford led to execution, and accordingly he prepared himself by the ordering of his affairs. On the 23d of June, he gave notice to the King by the Bishop of London, that he had answered all complaints made against him concerning the University of Oxford, and that he intended to resign the office of Chancellor. The King approved his reasons, and on the 25th, he sent his resignation to the University, to be published in Convocation. It may readily be imagined, that this circumstance grieved him not a little. Towards Oxford he had manifested the utmost affection

and regard; the monuments of his magnificence were numerous in that noble University: it was the place of his education, where he had long resided, ere he was called into the business of public life. "God bless the University," says he, "and grant that they may never have need of me, now unable to help them." This letter to the University, containing his resignation, is eloquent and affecting. It is dated from the Tower, June 28, 1641. "My present condition is not unknown," says he, "to the whole world, yet by few pitied or deplored. The righteous God knows best the justice of my sufferings, on whom, both in life and death, I will conscientiously dépend; the last of which shall be unto me most welcome, in that my life is now burdensome unto me, my mind attended with a variety of sad and grievous thoughts, my soul continually vexed with anxieties and troubles, groaning under the burden of a displeased Parliament, my name aspersed and grossly slandered by the multiplicity of seditious pamphlets, and myself debarred from wonted access to the best of princes, while it is *vox populi* that I am Popishly affected. How earnest I have been in my disputations, exhortations, and otherwise, to quench such sparks lest they should become coals, I hope after my death you will all acknowledge. Yet in the midst of my afflictions, there is nothing more hath so nearly touched me as the remembrance of your free and joyful acceptance of me to be your Chancellor, and that I am now shut up from being able to do you

that service which you might justly expect from me. When I first received this honour, I intended to have carried it with me to my grave, neither were my hopes less, since this Parliament, (called by his Majesty's royal command,) committed me to this royal prison. But still, by reason of matters of greater consequence yet in hand, as the Parliament is pleased to procrastinate my trial, I do hereby as thankfully resign my office of Chancellor, as ever I received that dignity; entreating you to elect some honourable person, who, upon all occasions, may be ready to serve you, and I beseech God send you such an one as may do all things for his glory, and the furtherance of your famous University. This is the continual prayer of your dejected friend and Chancellor, being the last time I shall so write."

The Earl of Pembroke succeeded the Archbishop as Chancellor, who had long intrigued for the office, and who blushed not to abuse the venerable Primate, whose Chancellorship had been so beneficial to the University. Laud endured, however, a greater misfortune, in the sequestration of his jurisdiction by the House of Peers on the 23d of October, when the government of the arch-diocese was entrusted to his inferior officers. This was done at the instigation of Williams, now Archbishop of York; "by his importunity," says the learned Henry Wharton, "he obtained it, to the great prejudice of the Church, and no small infamy of himself"—"a bitter revenge, which no art or colour

can defend." It was also ordered that this sequestration was to continue till the Archbishop was convicted or acquitted of the charge of high treason; "and farther, concerning those ecclesiastical benefices, promotions, or dignities that are at his disposal, he shall present to this House the names of such persons as shall be nominated by him to the same, to be approved of by this House, before they be collated or instituted." The manifest injustice of this requires no comment, and the infamy of Archbishop Williams, in this dastardly revenge, and in pursuing with unrelenting fury a fallen enemy, are equally incapable of vindication.

The King was at this time in Scotland, but *his* fate was also in progress. While with the most knavish hypocrisy, the leaders declared to the unfortunate monarch "that they would make him as glorious a potentate and as rich a prince as any of his predecessors," they were more securely laying their plans, by which it was impossible he could escape their snares. The Scots, of course, were held as invaluable auxiliaries by the republican enthusiasts; their affected zeal for religion was an indication of their holy dispositions: yet it is a singular fact, that many of the most fanatical lay-champions of the Covenant, nay, some of the preachers, were grossly licentious in their public and private lives. The contemptible voluptuousness of the Earl of Rothes, the dissolute morals of the Chancellor Loudon, whose wife, "a godly lady," threatened him with a process of adultery, which she could very

well prove, if he would not take the Covenant—the treason, moreover, of that nobleman, and his vile hypocrisy, were notorious; and other instances might be adduced. Yet such men as these, utterly destitute of principle, were addressed by the enthusiastic and obscene preachers of the Covenant, to wit, Samuel Rutherford, Livingstone, Cant, and other enthusiasts, as the most devoted saints; their licentiousness was overlooked, their adherence to the Covenant covered a multitude of sins. Nay, Rutherford, in a letter to Loudon, makes that nobleman certain of heaven for his "good deeds." This, of course, the Covenanted Presbyterians could easily do, who blushed not to assert that the conclave termed the Presbytery could keep out or admit into Heaven, as they pleased; and, therefore, the same power, doubtless, could be exercised towards *believing* noblemen [1].

The English Parliament proceeded rapidly in the path of opposition. The two preaching enthusiasts, Burgess and Marshall, possessed greater influence in the two Houses than had Laud at any period in the Court; while the northern Covenanter, Henderson, with his brethren, interfered more in politics, than the whole Scottish Bishops. The affected sanctity of the enthusiasts was no less cunning: it was truly the reign of sectarian inquisition. A weekly fast was held every Wednesday, which, with

[1] Scot's Staggering State of Scotch Statesmen, p. 24. Bishop Burnet's Own Times, vol. i. p. 44. Lamont's Diary, p. 38. Letters of Samuel Rutherford, dated January 4, 1638, &c.

the King's fast every Friday, allowed only four days weekly for business. A proclamation was issued to stop public diversions, and a general monthly fast, (in addition to the weekly one appointed by the Parliament,) with a lecture every morning at seven o'clock, was appointed in their stead. "No barber," says a writer, "would shave on Sunday, no ferryman would carry a passenger across the Thames, nor could a man even sit undisturbed at his own door. We doubt not that in these devotions and decencies there was much genuine piety, and so far they are worthy of our admiration: but it is a melancholy truth, that the heart may sing psalms, and yet be deceitful above all things. On one occasion, 8th of August, 1641, this same godly Parliament, pleading necessity, sat all Sunday for the dispatch of business. What would they have said had this been done by the opposite party? The Prynnes, Pyms, Burtons, and enthusiasts of that age, would have thought it the most awful crime, and worthy of itself to be visited with rebellion. How easily do men excuse to themselves those very faults which they condemn in others[1]."

On the 25th of November the King returned from Scotland, and in London he was received with extraordinary demonstrations of joy. This, however, was of no long continuance. The Commons, finding they could not now be dissolved without their own

[1] Johnson Grant's English Church and Sects, vol. ii. p. 184, 185. (An admirable work.)

consent, daily made rapid advances in tyrannical power. Any proceedings they thought fit to undertake were termed "a branch of their privileges," and the slightest objection was quickly visited with censure as "a breach of their privileges." The conduct of this tremendous tribunal was the most refined tyranny. Their grand design was in the mean time against the Church, as they easily perceived that while the Church stood secure, their triumph was only half gained. A bill had been already introduced against the votes of the Bishops, which had been rejected in the House of Lords, but a second bill was introduced into the Commons, "for the utter eradication of all bishops, deans, and chapters, with all chancellors, officials, and officers belonging to them." This bill had met with no better success than the former, although, at the second reading, when the whole House resolved itself into a Committee, the zealots had thrust the celebrated Earl of Clarendon, then Mr. Edward Hyde, into the chair, to prevent his obstruction of their designs by speeches, as he was a decided enemy to the bill. These defeats, however, by no means discouraged the faction. The prelates were every where insulted and treated with contempt. Mobs of fanatics, headed by the preachers, and secretly encouraged by the Commons, beset the House of Peers, exclaiming, "No Bishops, no Popish Lords!" Pym, rejoicing in these seditious tumults, said, "God forbid they should by any means dishearten people from obtaining their just demands in such a

way." With the most unparalleled absurdity it was declared in the House, by the sages, that "Popery and Prelacy had ruined trade." The Bishops were insulted in their way to the House of Lords; coming by water to the House on St. Stephen's day, they were assailed by a shower of stones from the rabble, and with some difficulty escaped the fate of that protomartyr. The usual outcry of "No bishops," resounded on every side; sometimes a scuffle ensued between the King's servants and the rude assailants, as on that occasion when one of the officers of the King's Guard, at Whitehall, named David Hyde, threatened to cut the throats of those round-headed dogs who bawled against bishops, whence arose the terms, *Cavaliers* and *Roundheads*, which distinguished the two great parties before the Restoration. To complete their folly, the Commons received a petition against Bishops from the *Apprentices* of London.

The Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission had been abolished shortly after Strafford's murder; and it was now resolved to get rid of the Bishops in a summary manner. Thirteen of their number had been impeached as having a share in the late canons, but they were allowed three months to prepare their defence. The insolence, however, to which the prelates were subjected was intolerable, and Williams, in the name of twelve of his brethren, addressed the King, protesting against all the proceedings of Parliament during their compulsory absence. This was an enormous offence; the pro-

testing Bishops were immediately arraigned for high treason, and sent to the Tower, with the exception of Hall of Norwich, and Morton of Durham, who were committed to the custody of the Black Rod. After eighteen days' imprisonment, ten of the prelates were released; but the flagrant outrage was completed on the 6th of February 1641, by the passing of the bill in both Houses, that the Bishops should have no votes in Parliament, nor interfere in civil affairs. The triumph was celebrated in London by bonfires and the ringing of bells. In a fatal moment the King signed the bill, according to some, at the entreaty of the Queen; but it matters not who recommended it: the unfortunate monarch was already marked out as a victim[1].

It may readily be supposed that the Primate did not behold these things unmoved. His own misfortunes had proved his regard for the Church, yet he expresses himself with moderation on the subject, and in the language of resignation. "If it prove that the King and kingdom may have joy in it," says he, "it is well: but it may be that the effects of this eclipse may work farther than is now imagined, and the blackness of it darken the power of the temporal lords more than is anticipated." His enemies, however, in the multiplicity of their occupations, had not forgotten him. Though he had now been fifteen months a prisoner, most unjustly

[1] Rushworth, Part iii. vol. i. p. 276, &c.

confined for no specific crime, and there was no rumour of his intended trial, yet the parliament kept him in remembrance. On the 20th of January, the Lords ordered the cannon at Lambeth Palace, which he had provided at the expence of 300*l.* to be taken away by the London sheriffs[1]. As the Puritan preachers were every where intruded into the parishes, the zealots persecuted the Archbishop for refusing to collate them to his own livings. By a wise precaution, he had permitted all his benefices as they became vacant since his confinement, to relapse into the crown. He was compelled to present an enthusiast named Smith to the parish of St. Leonard, Foster Lane, a benefice which had relapsed into his gift by the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, in whose gift it is; and the Bishop of London refused to collate during the time appointed by law, the incumbent, Ward, having been forced to resign by a parliamentary committee, on account of some pretended innovations. The rectory of Stisted, in Essex, with the benefice of Bocking and Lackingdon, in the same county, all in his gift, had also become vacant. To the former he wished to collate Richard Howlett, Bachelor in Divinity, and a clergyman of the Irish Church, who had been compelled to leave that country by the atrocious rebellion of 1641, induced by the example of the Scottish Covenanters; and whose wife was his own near relation. One Clarke, however, was re-

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 187.

commended to Stisted, at the instance of the Earl of Warwick, but the Archbishop refused to collate him, and the rectory lapsed to the King. At the command of the House of Lords, he collated Dr. Gauden to Bocking, and he succeeded, through the interest of Lord Kimbolton, in securing Lackingdon for Howlett, who was at this time in a state of great destitution.

The Archbishop's troubles, however, were not confined to these vexations. He was insulted in the Tower chapel by the Puritan preachers in their sermons, who took that opportunity to increase the trials of this venerable man. They selected inflammatory texts of Scripture, and with that fanatical cowardice which delights to triumph over virtue in distress, they indulged in a strain of invective, thereby polluting and profaning that religion which inculcates long-suffering and charity. On the 19th of August his Palace of Lambeth was forcibly entered by a company of soldiers, and was plundered of all the fire-arms, though in the order formerly issued by the House of Lords, it had been expressly specified, that "a fit proportion of arms" was to be left at the Palace for its defence. On the 15th of October all the revenues of the Archbishopric were seized by the Parliament "for the use of the Commonwealth," and on the 9th of November, Lambeth Palace was occupied by a party of soldiers; under the pretence of keeping it for the public service, that venerable edifice was exposed to the plunder of the military rabble, and his ser-

vants were robbed of all their money; while on the 24th of that month, the military zealots broke into the chapel, and profaned it by their rude indecencies. He was also prohibited in the Tower from holding communications with any person save in the presence of the Warden; and his servants were prohibited from going into the city on any pretence, except for the purchase of provisions. On his own petition, indeed, to the House of Lords, his books and his other effects were ordered to be preserved; but on the 3d of December the incendiary Leighton, who had been liberated from the Fleet, came to him with a warrant from the Commons, demanding the keys of the Palace; and on the 5th of January it was converted into a prison, under the superintendence of Leighton, and his moveable goods were seized by the soldiers [1].

Such proceedings, before the Archbishop, let it be remembered, was brought to trial, reflect on the Parliament indelible infamy and disgrace. To expect justice after those atrocities was out of the question; nor is it necessary to comment on proceedings so directly contrary to law and equity. For, according to the constitution of England, and the law in criminal cases, no man's goods can be seized before he be condemned, if he is imprisoned on a charge for which the law demands forfeiture; consequently, while the Archbishop was imprisoned only on presumptive charges, the conduct of his

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 196—198.

enemies was utterly unjustifiable. He had petitioned again and again for a trial, but had been refused; nay, even when the Earl of Holland moved, in the House of Lords, for an investigation of the charges brought against him, (for which he received the Primate's grateful acknowledgments,) that he might be punished, if guilty, or otherwise released—though it caused a message to be sent to the Commons, the worthies of that House did not bestir themselves in the matter. The above hardships, however, were not all which the Commons inflicted. On the motion of the infamous regicide, Hugh Peters, and others, it was proposed to banish him and Bishop Wren to New England; but it was rejected, a more summary vengeance being in reserve. After the sequestration of his revenues, he was of course left utterly destitute of any maintenance, and yet it was expected that he should defray his expences. Reduced to poverty, he was compelled to petition the Parliament, on the 23d of May, 1643, for a maintenance, "humbly praying that their Lordships would take his sad case into their honourable consideration, that something might be allowed him out of his estate to supply the necessities of life, assuring himself that in honour and justice they would not suffer him to beg or starve." But, to the infamy of the Parliament, it was refused, merely because he would not collate one of their enthusiastic zealots to a benefice. Property to the amount of 200*l.* he had in Lambeth Palace, and when he desired that some of it might be sent

to the Tower for his use, he also received a refusal from his enemies. All his goods in the Palace were sold for scarcely a third part of their value: his books and papers were seized; the windows of his chapel at Lambeth were defaced and broken; the steps to the communion table torn up; and an order was issued, prohibiting him from any exercise, or from leaving his own apartments in the Tower without the attendance of his keeper; and a few days afterwards the Parliament issued another order, prohibiting him from bestowing any benefice, "but with leave and order of both Houses [1]."

Thus far had the Archbishop's enemies proceeded, "tearing him piece-meal," as Heylin expresses it, before they were ready for his trial. And it is impossible to pass over this part of the Primate's troubles and trials, without animadverting on the gross injustice of his enemies. In all the actions of those boasted and so highly applauded champions of liberty and the rights of the people, the same tyranny was invariably displayed: and no better proof can be adduced that a popular tribunal is the most liable to dreadful excesses. They clamoured about the rights of the subject, and yet their own acts were direct outrages on that liberty. They had imprisoned the Archbishop, but for what? They said it was for high treason, but how could it be proved? He had never appeared in arms against

[1] Rushworth, Part iii. vol. ii. p. 320. Troubles and Trials, p. 198. 203, 204.

his sovereign, nor had he endeavoured at any time to excite rebellion. Setting this aside, however, it was despotism unheard of and unknown, to punish him before he had been found guilty,—and they gave evident demonstrations that no property would be secure, the owner of which had incurred their resentment; nor did they imagine, with all their pretexts for religion and liberty, that these violations were in reality so many encouragements to incendiaries to proceed in their daring and impious practices, satisfied that they would be protected if they adhered to the zealots. And what are we to think of men who could thus prove themselves so utterly abandoned, while at the same time they were mocking the Deity by their professions of religion?

The Archbishop himself had not so acted in the days of his prosperity; for though he had necessarily aided in silencing schismatical incendiaries, he had respected the rights of the subject, and punishment was not inflicted on their persons until they had been formally condemned. But when the factious demagogues acquired the ascendancy, it was otherwise managed. And how easy is it to mislead the unthinking and the wrong-thinking by popular clamour? If, in the height and the exultation of that power which they had so craftily arrogated to themselves, they had been distinguished by moderation, and a real desire to rectify alleged abuses, different indeed would have been the estimation of their characters; they would have been entitled to the

praise of patriotic men. But when we find that religion and liberty were only the watchwords for dark designs; that the cant of Presbyterianism, and the notions of Independents, Gospellers, and other sectaries, were equally employed to further the cause of rebellion—that the sovereign was insulted, his ministers marked out as victims of their vengeance, and a tribunal erected before which men trembled in despair,—those men must be divested of those honours which the violence of modern partisanship has so liberally awarded to them. "Some persons," says Mr. Hume, "partial to the leaders who now defended public liberty, have ventured to put them in balance with the most illustrious characters of antiquity, and mention the names of Pym, Hampden, and Vane, as a just parallel to those of Cato, Brutus, and Cassius. Profound capacity, indeed, undaunted courage, extensive enterprise—in these three particulars, perhaps, the Romans do not surpass the English patriots. But what a difference, when the discourse, conduct, conversation, and private as well as public behaviour, of both are inspected! Compare only one circumstance, and consider its consequence. The leisure of these noble ancients was totally employed in the cultivation of polite letters and civilized society; the whole discourse and language of the moderns were polluted with mysterious jargon, and full of the lowest and most vulgar hypocrisy."

In all probability, however, the Archbishop would have been brought to his trial, for his grand enemy

Prynne was at this time indefatigable, had not the attention of Parliament been directed to other objects. The King, enraged that all his concessions had only increased their insolence—that they scrupled not to calumniate him in the vilest manner —that they had allured the Scots to England, and fostered the fanaticism of the Covenanters, had instructed his Attorney-General to impeach Lord Kimbolton, Holles, Hazlerigg, Hampden, Strode, and Pym, in the House of Commons. Those incendiaries averted a fate which they probably would have received, and which they had incurred, by receiving private information that the King was to demand them in person in the House of Commons, and they prudently withdrew. They betook themselves into the city, which was then the strong-hold of sedition; they roused their partisans, and a tumultuous rabble proceeded to Westminster in the pride of seditious fanaticism. The unhappy monarch, sensible of his rashness, retired to Hampton Court, and abandoned himself to grief. The disasters which followed it is foreign to our purpose to detail. On the 26th of Jan. 1642-3, the bill for abolishing Episcopacy passed in the Upper House, on which occasion the Archbishop has remarked, "God be merciful to this sinking Church." That bill had been previously passed in the Commons, on the 1st of September, and in the House of Lords on the 10th, previous to the enactment already alluded to, that "all rents and profits of all Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, and Chapters, and

other delinquents, should be sequestrated for the use and service of the Commonwealth." The royal standard was raised at Nottingham; the King was thus driven into the unnatural war. The loyalists rallied round their sovereign; but it was in vain to struggle against the overwhelming torrent of rebellion.

The Scottish Covenanters, at whose instance the Archbishop had been imprisoned, fearing that they would yet lose their victim, now commenced their practices. An army of Presbyterian enthusiasts arrived from Scotland to aid their "dear brethren" in England against the King, at the invitation of the Parliament, having first, however, received an assurance that their Covenant would be taken, and their old enemy the Archbishop brought to trial. An Assembly of Divines, as they were termed, was empowered to sit at Westminster, to consult on religion, composed of furious Calvinists, Presbyterians and Puritans—"an excellent conclave!" says the Primate, "but I pray God that befall not them which Tully observes fell upon Epicurus, *Si quæ corrigere voluit, deteriora fecit.*" It is, however, almost superfluous to mention these events here. The Covenant was sworn in St. Margaret's, Westminster, by the combined enthusiasts, after a sermon preached by Coleman to justify its *piety* and *lawfulness*, and yet it stipulated that Popery and Prelacy were to be extirpated *by the sword*, and the Presbyterianism of Scotland established with all the horrors of Calvinism, the intolerance of Presbytery, and the arro-

gance of its heaven-derived powers. The Covenant was made imperative to be taken or sworn by all ranks. The persecutions which followed the refusal of this Calvinistic oath are innumerable. "Certain I am," says Heylin, in his quaint though forcible style, "that if all such as died in the war on that account may not go for martyrs, all such as irrecoverably lost their estates and livings for the refusal of it, may be called confessors. Others, with no unhappy curiosity, observing the number of the words which make up their Covenant, abstracted from its preface and conclusion, found them amounting in the total to 666, neither more nor less, which being the number of the Beast in the Revelation, pursued with such an open persecution, and prosecuted to the loss of so many lives, the undoing of so many families, and the subverting of the government in Church and State, may very justly entitle it to so much of Antichrist, as others have endeavoured to confer on the Popes of Rome. For if the Pope shewed any thing of the spirit of Antichrist, by bringing Cranmer, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, to the stake, at Oxford, this Covenant, and the makers of it, did express no less in bringing the last Protestant Archbishop to the block in London."

There is more truth in the last part of the preceding remarks than may at first sight appear. It seems indisputable that the Archbishop like Strafford, fell a sacrifice to the intolerable fanaticism of the Scots Covenanters. From all the documents

which exist on the subject, it is evident that this career of blood was accelerated by them, for his trial was either hastened or delayed according to the movements of their army in England. Nay, Edmund Ludlow, a famous ring-leader of the Republican party, candidly says, that he was "beheaded for the encouragement of the Scots [1]." But the most convincing proof that he fell a victim to Covenanting fury is to be found in the fourth stipulated article at the swearing of the Covenant in St. Margaret's; which is not only a virtual condemnation of the Primate before his trial, but an express declaration that he was to be put to death, whether innocent or not. In that article it was agreed, "That they should, with all diligence and faithfulness, discover all such as have been or *shall be* incendiaries, *malignants*, or evil instruments, by hindering the reformation of religion, dividing the King from his people, or one of the kingdoms from another, or making any faction or parties amongst the people, contrary to this League and Covenant, that they may be brought to public trial, and receive condign punishment, as the degree of their offences shall require or deserve; or the supreme judicatories of both kingdoms respectively, or others from them, for that effect shall judge convenient."

The triumph of the sectaries was now complete, and, in particular, of the most intolerant of all sects, the Presbyterians, who yielded not in that respect

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 83.

to the Papacy of Rome. Of all the sects which obtained the mastery in that age of fierce contention, the most tolerant were the Independents; for which they were bitterly reviled by the Presbyterians. Although the ephemeral triumph of the latter in England was marked by a very different feature from Scottish Presbytery, inasmuch as they acknowledged the supremacy of the civil power in spiritual matters; yet they denied the Independents separate places of worship, before their domination was terminated by Cromwell. The intolerance of Presbytery was a consequence of its arrogant pretensions; for its votaries not only valiantly asserted that their church was the true Church, but they converted the moderation of the Independents into an argument for intolerance; while by this very argument they were virtually condemning their own schism from the Episcopal Church. It is doubtless true, that Popery and Prelacy were excluded from the Independents' toleration; but the Solemn League and Covenant not only voted the extirpation of these, but also of Independency, Erastianism, Arminianism, in short, of every sect. Hence they received a just and merited reproof from the Independents. "It is hard," say the latter, "that we should be deprived of toleration in separate worship and discipline, on account of our coming so near our brethren. The Presbyterians think there is no middle way betwixt uniformity and utter confusion, and that the civil sword is an ordinance of God in their hands to determine all controversies in theology." This last feature of

Presbytery is strictly just; the Independents might have concluded by drawing a parallel between the pretensions of the Presbyterians and those of the Papists.

In thus commenting on the ridiculous pretensions of the Presbyterians of that age, there is no advocating of Independency, but candour obliges to confess the truth. And to shew that I do not libel the Presbyterians, to whom one of the most virtuous metropolitans of England fell a victim, I would refer the reader, in the first instance, to the tyrannical rule of their great apostle, Calvin at Geneva; secondly, to the conduct of John Knox in Scotland; thirdly, to the furious zeal of the Melvilles and their associates; fourthly, and perhaps chiefly, to the Solemn League and Covenant; fifthly, to the rebellion they excited both before and after the Restoration; and lastly, after their triumph in Scotland in 1688, to the persecutions they inflicted upon the Scottish Episcopal clergy, after the insurrections of 1715 and 1745, the only crime of whom was a just, though it may be, a mistaken principle of loyalty towards an exiled House. On all these points it is impossible for me at present to press the arguments *ad verecundiam*. Yet to shew farther that there is no lack of authorities in proof, with respect to the era of which I now write, I would refer to the works (among others) of their oracle, Samuel Rutherford, not only to his "Lex Rex," but to the sermon with which he edified the House of Commons on Jan. 31, 1643, published in 4to., and particularly to his

"Free Disputation against pretended Liberty of Conscience," 4to. London, 1649. It is needless to take notice of the absurd productions of the pretended Covenanting martyrs after the Restoration. Some other productions of this period on this subject are only briefly enumerated. There is the Letter of the London Ministers, who were then Presbyterians, to the Assembly of Divines, against Toleration, (4to. 1645.) A letter from "the Ministers about Colchester," on the same subject, (fol. 1645.) "Anti-Toleration, or a Modest Defence of the London Ministers to the Reverend Assembly of Divines," (4to. 1646.) "Proper Persecution, or the sandy foundation of a General Toleration discovered," (1646.) "Real Persecution, or the foundation of a General Toleration displayed," (1647.) "A Testimony from the *Kirk of Scotland* against Toleration," (1649.) The curious reader, who inclines to pursue this subject farther, and to examine the numerous pamphlets, will find it treated with great ingenuity, though with much satire and virulence, in the productions of this period, particularly in "The Nativity of Sir John Presbyter, compared with the Rodulphine and Lamberger Tables," (4to. 1645.) "The Burden, or the Tyrannical Power and Practices of the Presbyteriall Government in Scotland," (4to. 1646.) "The Scotch Presbyterian Weather-cock perched upon our English steeples," (4to. 1647.) "A gilded Pill for a new-moulded Presbyter," (1647.) "The last Will and Testament of Sir John Presbyter, also his Epitaph," (1647.)

"The Lamentation of the Ruling Lay Elders, bemoaning the death of Sir John Presbyter deceased," (1647.) "The Ghost of Sir John Presbyter," (1647.) "Sir John Presbyter not dead," (*Gehenna*, 1647.) It is needless to refer to the numerous productions of the Cavaliers and Independents before and after the Restoration. Perhaps that remarkable pamphlet ought not to be omitted, "The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, or the Foolishness of their Teaching discovered from their books, sermons, and prayers," which was first printed at London in quarto, 1693.

We have seen that the triumph of the sectaries was now complete—the inevitable consequence of the fall of the Church, and of the establishment of the Covenant. And here I would refer the reader to the well-known work of Thomas Edwards, himself a Presbyterian, entitled "Gangraena, or a Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies, and Pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this Time." The first part of this work was published in 1645, and the author of it asserts, in the title-page, that the Errors, &c. had been "vented and acted in England in these *four last years*," that is, from 1640-1, the very years in which the Covenanters entered England. This is a remarkable fact. This writer, one of their party, declares, that they were guilty of all manner of outrages; and not less than one hundred and seventy-six blasphemous and heretical tenets are enumerated by him[1]. The picture he gives, though perhaps

[1] Gangraena, 4to. edit. 1645, p. 16—36.

high coloured, and at least not altogether applicable to modern Dissenters, is truly deplorable. In the Epistle Dedicatory "to the Right Honourable the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament," he thus exclaims, "O cursed be the silence and flattery that are in such a time as this: For now things are grown to a strange pass, (though nothing is now strange,) and every day things grow worse and worse, and you can hardly conceive and imagine them so bad as they are; no kind of blasphemy, heresy, disorder, confusion, but either is found among us, or is coming in upon us; for we, instead of a Reformation, are grown from one extreme to another, fallen from Scylla into Charybdis, from Popish innovations, superstitions, and prelatical tyranny, to damnable heresies, horrid blasphemies, libertinism, and fearful anarchy; our evils are not removed and cured, but only changed."—"You have, most noble senators," says he, "done worthily against Papists, Prelates, and scandalous ministers, in casting down images, altars, crucifixes, throwing out ceremonies, &c. but what have you done against other kinds of growing evils, heresy, schism, disorders, Seekers, Anabaptists, Antinomians, Brownists, Libertines, and other sects? You have destroyed Baal and his priests, but have you been zealous against the golden calves, and the priests of the lowest of the people? are not these grown up, and daily increasing among you? are any effectual means used against them? You have made a Reformation, and blessed be God who

put it into your hearts to do such things; but with the Reformation have we not a Deformation; and worse things come upon us than ever we had before? Were any of those monsters heard of heretofore who are now common amongst us, as denying the Scriptures, pleading for a toleration of all religions and worships. Yea, for blaspheming, and denying there is a God. You have put down the Book of Common Prayer, and there are many among us have put down the Scriptures, slighting, yea, blaspheming them. You have broken the images of the Trinity, Christ, Virgin Mary, and the Apostles; and we have those who overthrow the doctrine of the Trinity, oppose the divinity of Christ, speak evil of the Virgin Mary, slight the Apostles. You have cast out bishops and their officers, and we have many that cast down to the ground all ministers in all the Reformed Churches. You have cast out ceremonies in the sacraments, as the cross, kneeling at the Lord's Supper; and we have many cast out the sacraments—baptism, and the Lord's Supper. You have put down saints' days, and we have many making nothing at all of the Lord's day and fast days. You have taken away the superfluous excessive maintenance of the Bishops and Deans, and we have many take away and cry down the necessary maintenance of ministers. In the bishops' times, Popish innovations were introduced, as bowing at altars, &c. and now we have anointing the sick with oil; then we had bishopping of children, now we have bishopping of men and women

by strange laying on of hands. The worst of the prelates, in the midst of many Popish, Arminian tenets, and Popish innovations, held many sound doctrines, and had many commendable practices, yea, the very Papists hold and keep to many articles of faith and truths of God, have some order among them, encourage learning, have certain fixed principles of truth, with practices of doctrines and good works [1]; but many of the sects and sectaries of our days deny all principles of religion, are enemies to all holy duties, order, learning, overthrowing all, being *vertiginosi spiritus;* and the great opinion of an universal toleration tends to the laying all waste, and dissolution of all religion and good manners." In another place, Edwards tells us that "there are swarms of all sorts of illiterate mechanic preachers, yea, of women and boy preachers."

As a natural consequence, too, of this reign of enthusiasm and parliamentary rebellion, the most Vandal ferocity was exhibited towards the fine arts. A furious ordinance was passed in Parliament against pictures, altars, fonts, crosses, images, surplices, and organs: this ordinance was faithfully obeyed, and even Neal admits that "the beauty of Cathedrals was somewhat defaced." The coincidence between these proceedings and those in Scotland at an earlier date under the auspices of Knox, is no less remarkable. The sacrilegious invaders were English Presbyterians commanded by Scots

[1] Calvini Instructio, adversus Libertinos, cap. iv.

Covenanters. I have already mentioned the rude attacks made on Lambeth Chapel, which the Archbishop notices in his Diary; but it will hardly be believed that the body of the venerable Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, buried in his own Chapel at Lambeth Palace under a tomb erected by himself, was torn from its resting-place by the regicide Scott, and thrust into a hole near an out-house, while he sold the leaden coffin to a plumber. There lay those sacred remains till the happy Restoration of 1660, when the excellent Archbishop Juxon procured their re-interment.—Scott had got possession of the Palace, and he piously turned the chapel into a ball-room. It is right, however, to mention, that this disgraceful transaction took place in 1648[1]. This year a band of military rebels broke the windows of painted glass in St. Margaret's Westminster, (it being with the utmost difficulty that the grand east window was secretly preserved), and defaced the tombs and monuments in the Church[2]. The Cross in Cheapside, an ancient and glorious monument of Christianity, was laid prostrate by Puritanical fury, "with sound of trumpet," says the author of Mercurius Aulicus, "and the noise of several instruments, as if they had obtained some remarkable victory over the greatest enemies of the Christian faith." In Westminster Abbey, that hallowed pile, sacred as the resting-

[1] Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker. Aubrey's Hist. and Antiq. of Surrey, vol. v. p. 275.

[2] Mercurius Aulicus, p. 228.

place of kings and princes, and men who were the glory of their several ages, every spot of which is "holy haunted ground, not cast in vulgar mould," abominations were committed under the sanction of this godly Parliament, which may well vie with the fury manifested by the northern hordes who overran the Roman Empire. The tombs were mutilated and broken; the stone crosses defaced; the brutal soldiery burnt the altar rails as they stood, and then sat down to drink ale and smoke tobacco with the Presbyterian preachers on the communion table.

In Canterbury, organs, robes, velvet cloths, altar-rails, every thing was destroyed. On the hangings were wrought, in the finest workmanship, several figures of Christ: the impious soldiers swore they would stab him, and rip up his bowels, which they actually did: and at an image of our Lord they discharged forty muskets, raising their profane shouts when the face was disfigured. Exeter Cathedral was profaned and polluted by those enthusiasts with the most shocking indecencies. The like was done at Worcester, and in addition they burnt the Bibles and Prayer-books. At Winchester they demolished the furniture of the choir, the glass windows, and tombs. The brutal Puritan Reformers in the Cathedral of Chichester, plucked out the eyes from a statue of Edward VI., because he had established the Liturgy: they seized the communion vessels; and when one cup was requested out of the spoil,

to administer the Eucharist, a wooden dish was tauntingly recommended. In Lichfield Cathedral, they demolished the monuments and windows, stabled their horses in the chancel, tore up the pavement, hunted cats with hounds through the church, and, to add to their wickedness, brought a calf to the baptismal font, and sprinkled it with water in the name of the blessed Trinity, as a mockery of the holy sacrament. Similar profanation was bestowed on Lincoln by Oliver Cromwell, that patron of sectaries. Exeter, Peterborough, Salisbury, Gloucester, the chapels of the University of Cambridge, besides the collegiate and parochial churches, all received visitations from those sons of Belial. The incomparable Chapel of Henry VII. at Westminster was also profaned by those sacrilegious enthusiasts: the windows of the Royal Chapel at Whitehall were dashed to pieces, and the communion table broken [1]. The sum of 6000*l.*, collected to build St. Andrew's Church, Holborn, was seized, and 400*l.* demanded from Guildford Hospi-

[1] How appropriate the language of the inspired King of Israel! "Thine adversaries roar in the midst of thy congregations, and set up their banners for tokens. He that hewed timber afore out of the thick trees, was known to bring to it an excellent work. But now they break down all the carved work thereof with axes and hammers. They have set fire upon thy holy places, and have defiled the dwelling-place of thy name, even unto the ground. Yea, they said in their hearts, Let us make havock of them altogether: thus have they burnt up all the houses of God in the land." Psalm lxxiv. 5—9.—*Ut quid, Deus?*"

tal, Surrey, to promote their rebellion [1]. And to aid this war against every venerable decoration and sacred edifice, a pamphlet was circulated, entitled, "The Holy Harmony, or a Plea for the abolishing of organs, and other music out of the Protestant Churches of Great Britain, and demolishing of superstitious and idolatrous monuments, with a plenary expression of the Parliament's Piety, the City's Charity, and the Country's Constancy [2]."

During these triumphs of fanaticism, the venerable Laud was languishing in prison, subject to rigorous confinement, and actually subsisting on the charity of his friends, since all his revenues had been sequestrated to fill the coffers of his enemies [3]. The enthusiasts were indefatigable in circulating libels against him, of the most scandalous and disgraceful kind. In 1642, appeared in 4to. "A Copie of a Letter written from his Holiness' Court at Rome, to his Grace of Canterburie's Palace, now in the Tower."—"An Examination of his Life," was published in a tract, 1643, as also a pretended petition of his "to both Houses, wherein he desires not to be transported to New England," (4to. 1643.) The same year a pamphlet was printed, addressed to him in the form of a letter, "On his Inclination to Popery." As might be expected, these productions are supersatured with falsehood and malevolence. It was by them, indeed, that the

[1] Sir William Dugdale's Short View of the Late Troubles in England, Oxford, folio, 1681. p. 553—562.

[2] Printed at London. 4to. in 1643. [3] Heylin, p. 481.

public feeling was kept alive against him, and the ignorant or fanatical really believed every falsehood which the enemies of this great prelate cunningly circulated.

Perhaps the most scurrilous, however, of the libels which appeared against the Archbishop in this or the preceding years, is that entitled "A New Disputation between the two lordly Bishops, Yorke and Canterbury," which is declared to be "very necessary for observation, and well worth the reading [1]."

[1] A small 18mo. "written in English Prose by L. P. Feb. the 2d, 1642," with this motto prefixed,

"The simple sort live most at rest,
While lordly Bishops are distrest."

There are wood-cuts of Laud and Williams, the former as if in chains, and it concludes with a song in eight stanzas, to the tune of "Banks his bill of fare." As a specimen of it, I may introduce a short quotation. To a question about the Cross in Cheapside, asked by the Primate, Williams is made to reply, "If it please your graceless Grace, my little Lord, you know that I ever hated Papistry from the beginning, for which cause you caused me to suffer a long time imprisonment. Moreover, you thought to have seen me end my life, but now I may chance to live to see your end." The Primate says, "You talk like one overjoyed, but tell me one thing at your leisure, have you given in your answer to the charge which was the other day laid against you at the Parliament, or have you never seen the Welshman's petition?" "I would have you answer to this question," replies Williams, "and then I shall answer you the better. What news do you hear from Rome? hath your ghostly father the Pope ever a pardon in store for you? Are you sure that when you die you shall be canonized for a saint? resolve me that question, Canterbury." "Methinks," says the Archbishop,

This pamphlet was written and published in 1642, at the time when Williams and his brethren were committed to the Tower by the Commons, the consequence, if the noble historian is to be credited, of the imprudence of Williams. "He carried himself so violently in the House and out of the House to all persons, that he became much more universally odious than ever the other Archbishop [Laud] had been, having many more enemies than he, and few or no friends, *of whom the other had abundance:* and the great hatred of the man's person and behaviour was the greatest invitation to the House of Commons to revive so irregularly the bill to remove the Bishops, and was their chief encouragement to hope that the Lords, who had rejected the former, would now pass and consent to the bill." This, though perhaps a little high coloured, is probably near the truth: certainly the behaviour of Williams at this juncture was the source of many misfortunes and calamities to the Primate.

Among the many remarkable persons who died this year, were two of the Archbishop's inveterate enemies, John Hampden and William Pym. The former was slain in an engagement between the royalists and the parliamentary rebels on Chalgreave

" your tongue runs a little too fast, Yorke. Have you any more questions to ask me?"—"Yes, more I think than you will be willing to answer."—"Let me hear," says Laud, "your excellent wit," &c. &c. (p. 56.) Such is a specimen of the low ribaldry in which the zealots indulged, and which was swallowed with avidity by the enthusiasts of that age.

Field. In the army of the latter he held a command. This individual has been famed for his alleged patriotism, and the worshippers at his shrine have not scrupled to exhibit him as a specimen of all that is great, and good, and illustrious. He certainly was a great man, and his remarkable conduct attracted the attention of the nation; but his claims to high and lofty patriotism will be diminished in the estimation of those who remember the fact, that had any attempts been made to gain him, he would have turned a zealous royalist, and that his particular ambition was to be appointed governor to the Prince of Wales. After the rash conduct of the King, however, in the House of Commons, in impeaching the five members, the hatred of this man became implacable. Towards the Church he had a peculiar enmity; a furious republican in principle, he obscured his abilities by his warmth in opposition; of great address and imagination, his cunning was proportionable to that bland appearance which he thought proper to assume while he wore the mask. He was an admirable soldier, a man of great penetration, vigilance, and industry; in short, the opinion which the noble historian has expressed of this justly celebrated man is sufficiently comprehensive. "He had a head to contrive, a tongue to persuade, and a hand to execute, any mischief."

William Pym was a man hardly less remarkable than Hampden, by whom he was much influenced in his conduct. So great had been Pym's authority,

that he was familiarly styled 'King Pym.' His conduct towards the Earl of Strafford, whom he pursued to the block, entails on his memory indelible infamy. He was not at first an *absolute patriot*, that is, a violent republican enthusiast, being greatly controuled by the Earl of Bedford; but, after the unfortunate death of that nobleman, who would have saved Strafford, Pym became connected with the Earl of Essex, whose influence at once fixed his principles. Both he and Hampden sought the destruction of the English monarchy; and however praiseworthy and virtuous might be their private life, it remains yet to be proved, that they possessed those qualities which are necessary to make good citizens. Pym was the idol of the populace, which of itself is calculated to render his political conduct suspicious. His associates buried him with extraordinary pageantry in Westminster Abbey, and his funeral sermon, which occupied two hours in delivery, was preached by a Puritan zealot, who compared him to St. John the Baptist—the forerunner of our Saviour!

CHAPTER XXII.

1643—1644.

Conduct of William Prynne—Preparations for the Archbishop's trial—Preliminary proceedings—Flagrant injustice of the Archbishop's enemies—Commencement of the trial—The Articles of Impeachment—Defence of the Archbishop's conduct—Investigation of the Articles—The Archbishop's reply—Gross injustice of his enemies—Insolence of his judges—General history of the proceedings—The Archbishop is found guilty.

The venerable Laud, now almost seventy-three years of age, had languished in prison nearly three years, ere his enemies brought him to his trial. During that time he had suffered innumerable hardships and privations; the Parliament had literally despoiled him of all he possessed; they had harassed him by their unjust and tyrannical injunctions; they had imprisoned him before they had specified his pretended crimes; they had sequestrated his revenues, sold his goods, and taken possession of his Palace, before he was even tried. These were indications to the venerable and afflicted Primate of the treatment he was to expect—a species of treatment which has few parallels in the annals of civilized nations.

In my former details I have anticipated a few events. On the 31st of May, 1643, the Archbishop's implacable enemy, William Prynne, having a warrant from what was termed the Close Committee[1], entered his apartments in the Tower, as soon as the gates were opened. Two soldiers were stationed at the Primate's door with loaded muskets, and three others entered the apartment with the fierce enthusiast. The Archbishop was in bed, as were also his servants. "I presently," says the pious and aged Primate, "thought upon my blessed Saviour, when Judas led in the swords and staves about him." Prynne proceeded to search his room for papers, and even rifled his pockets. The Archbishop demanded a sight of the warrant for this dastardly proceeding, which Prynne produced. The enthusiast carried away the Primate's Diary, containing all the occurrences of his life, [which Prynne afterwards published infamously mutilated, under the title of "A Breviat," but for the authentic copy of which the world is indebted to the learned Henry Wharton;] a copy of the Scottish Service-book, and his book of Private Devotions, with twenty-one parcels of papers which he had prepared for his defence[2].

Prynne promised faithfully to restore the papers within three or four days, but such was not his intention; and five months afterwards he returned only three of the parcels, out of the twenty-one

[1] Warrant apud Prynne's Breviat, p. 28.

[2] Troubles and Trials, p. 205, 206.

which he had so illegally taken from the Archbishop [1]. Laud's refusal to comply with the orders of Parliament respecting collations and institutions to his benefices, had caused that nefarious sequestration which left him not only in absolute poverty, but even without fees to pay his counsel [2].

Being the victim of the Scots, no sooner was the Covenant sworn, than his trial was brought on, to gratify those enthusiasts. Prynne having perused his papers, "by this time," says the Archbishop, "his malice had hammered out something." Fourteen articles had been exhibited against him in 1641; to these were now added ten more, much to the same import, the substance of which was, that he had endeavoured to introduce an arbitrary government, by causing the dissolution of the Parliament; that he had endeavoured to subvert the fundamental laws of the kingdom; that he had restrained the civil judges in the administration of their duty; various other minor matters were enumerated, particularly the affair of impropriations, and the Convocation of 1640, which was altogether ascribed to him [3].

These articles, being now in a somewhat digested form, were presented to the House of Lords by a lawyer named Wilde, on the 23d of October, and

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 211.

[2] Ibid. ut sup. Heylin, p. 481.

[3] Heylin, p. 489. Articles of the Commons, 4to. black letter, 1643.

on the same day the Archbishop was served with a notice from the House of Lords to prepare his answer before the 31st of the same month. Here was another instance of flagrant injustice. His revenues had been seized; he had subsisted upon the charity of his friends; it was not to be expected that he could employ and fee counsel, and prepare an answer to twenty-four articles in the space of seven days, especially after his papers had been taken away by Prynne. He was compelled to petition the Peers, beseeching them that longer time might be allowed him,—that counsel might be assigned him,—and that two lawyers, named Chute and Hearne, might be his counsel, and have liberty of access to him at all times,—and that money might be allowed him out of his estate "to fee his counsel, and defray his other charges, he having been for the last year very burdensome to his friends [1]."

As if ashamed of their flagrant injustice, the Archbishop's enemies complied with his petition, and he was ordered to prepare his defence by the 6th day of November following. On the 31st of October he was compelled to petition for a longer time, and they assigned to him the 13th of November; and on the 10th of that month, a warrant was issued to bring him before the House of Peers on that day. On the 13th of November he appeared at the bar of the House. The trial was again delayed, and at

[1] Heylin, p. 481. Canterburie's Doome, p. 41, 42. Rushworth, Part ii. vol. ii. p. 291.

length it commenced on the 12th day of March, 1643-4.

The transactions previous to the trial were marked by the same illegal and ungenerous conduct. His enemies had so framed the articles, that it was utterly impossible to distinguish them, and this was a source of infinite perplexity to his counsel. Prynne's conduct, too, with regard to the witnesses, was sufficiently infamous. That enthusiast had the management of the case against him, and it appears that he had previously corrupted some of the witnesses, keeping what the Archbishop terms "a school of instruction for those whom he could trust." Nay, so atrocious was Prynne's conduct, that a lawyer made this declaration, "The Archbishop is a stranger to me, but Prynne's tampering with the witnesses is so palpable and foul, that I cannot but pity him and cry shame." Describing the witnesses, the Archbishop says, "Many of the witnesses brought against me in this business are more than suspected sectaries and separatists from the Church, which by my place I was to punish, and that exasperated them against me; whereas by law, no schismatic ought to be received against his bishop. And many of these were witnesses in their own causes, and pre-examined before they came into court; at which pre-examination I was not present, nor any one for me, to cross interrogate. A pack of such witnesses as were never produced against any man of my place and condition, messengers and pursuivants, such as have renounced or changed their religion again and again;

pillory men and bawds. And these the men that must prove my correspondence with priests[1]."

The Archbishop's counsel were John Hearne, Chaloner Chute, Richard Gerrard, and Matthew Hale, lawyers; the last afterwards the celebrated Lord Chief Justice. The opposite counsel were, John Wylde, Serjeant-at-Law; John Maynard, Robert Nicholas, and Samuel Browne. Prynne acted as solicitor. The Archbishop's solicitor was his own secretary[2].

It is remarkable, that in this famous trial, which lasted five months, and during which the Archbishop was heard twenty days in his own defence, there were never above fourteen peers present at one time, generally about twelve; and one-third of these, we are informed, left the House every day before the business was half concluded. He appeared before his judges with the boldness of conscious innocence, venerable by his years and the sanctity of his Episcopal character; though the long period of his imprisonment had reduced him to great feebleness. Nevertheless, the vigour of his mind was unimpaired, and he prepared to defend himself with his wonted calmness.

The Archbishop appeared at the bar on the 12th of March, and Wilde opened the proceedings by a speech of some length, and concluded by informing

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 414. 417.

[2] Rushworth, vol. v. p. 821. 825. Troubles and Trials, p. 216. Wood. Athen. Oxon. vol. ii. col. 60.

their Lordships that he presented to them "a great man, who, like Naaman, was a leper." The Archbishop replied, in a speech wherein he repelled the charge of treason with virtuous indignation, as also the allegation that he was affected towards Popery. He enumerated the converts that he had made from that faith, and he challenged any clergyman to produce such incontestible proofs of his attachment to the Reformed Religion. It is needless to enumerate the various arguments: they are to be found at large in the Archbishop's "History of his Troubles and Trials." His principle of defence against the charge of treason is indisputable,—that a crime such as treason, cannot be established by any accumulation of charges, no one of which is treasonable, or, as his counsel stated it, "if the generals be not treason, the particular instances cannot be; and, on the other side, if the instances fall short of treason, the application to those generals cannot make them treason[1]."

A few of the general accusations, however, demand a particular notice. The seventh pretends to set forth, that the Archbishop had traitorously endeavoured to alter and subvert God's true religion, by law established in this realm, and instead thereof to set up Popish superstitions and idolatry—that he had urged and enjoined divers Popish and superstitious ceremonies without any warrant of law,

[1] See the Speech of the Archbishop's Counsel, History of Troubles and Trials, p. 423—431.

and cruelly persecuted those who opposed the same. The eighth declares, that he promoted in the Church those only who were "Popishly affected, or otherwise unsound and corrupt in doctrine and manners." The ninth, "that for the same traitorous and wicked intent, he employed such men to be his chaplains whom he knew to be notoriously disaffected to the Reformed Religion, grossly addicted to Popish superstitions, and erroneous and unsound both in judgment and practice." The tenth, that he endeavoured to reconcile the Churches of England and Rome, and "consorted and confederated with divers Priests and Jesuits." The eleventh, that "he in his own person, and his suffragans, chancellors, &c. have caused divers learned, pious, and orthodox preachers of God's word to be silenced, suspended, deprived, degraded, excommunicated," —that "he hath hindered the preaching of God's word," "increased and cherished ignorance and profaneness among the people, that so he might the better facilitate the way to the effecting of his own wicked and traitorous design of altering and corrupting the true religion here established."

Holding the speech and the argument both of the Archbishop and his counsel quite conclusive to refute the absurd charge of treason for the alleged civil offences, so much has been already said on almost all the above charges, which, let it be noted, constitute the general articles of impeachment for *high treason*, that it is needless here to resume the argument. From the above allegations, the truth

of Echard's remarks will appear, that "a heap of crimes and failings were brought against him by his accusers, who reached and examined into all the great and trifling actions of his life; every personal infirmity, every indiscreet action, and every hasty word that could be remembered, were sifted and aggravated, and the best and noblest of his performances were perverted with all imaginable spite and malice." Yet, in justice to the memory of this most virtuous and learned prelate, who, like St. Paul, was never permitted to answer for himself, a specimen of the manner in which this trial, so disgraceful and so infamous to the actors, was conducted, appears not to be out of place.

I. It was first alleged against the Archbishop, that he had a particular partiality for images, pictures, and stained glass windows in churches, which he evidently manifested in the repairs of his chapel in Lambeth Palace, contrary to the statutes 3d and 4th Edward VI. and the injunctions of Elizabeth; that he had erected crosses, and placed a statue of the Virgin in St. Mary's, Oxford—and that he had summoned Sheffield before the Star-Chamber, for defacing the window of a church in Salisbury. The last assertion was a gross falsehood, for Sheffield had been summoned by the Bishop of the diocese; moreover, he was censured for destroying the decorations of a church without the authority of the Bishop. The Archbishop replied, that images were in the churches earlier than the time of Constantine; that a congregation is mentioned by Tertul-

lian, who had a representation of Christ on the communion cup. Calvin himself was not averse to pictures of scriptural subjects, for he says, "Neque tamen eâ superstitione teneor, ut nullas prorsus imagines ferendas censeam, sed quia sculptura et pictura Dei dona sunt, purum et legitimum utriusque usum requiro[1]:"—that the Homilies allowed historical representations[2];—that images were in the church windows when he found them;—that he only repaired the windows which were broken, which he did not from any mass-book, but from comparing the broken fragments,—that he repaired them at his own expence, and at very great cost, on account of the extreme disorder of the chapel,—that stained windows are not forbidden by 3d Edward VI. c. 10. but statues only,—that the repairing a glass window was no high treason,—that the statue of the Virgin had been set up by Bishop Owen,—that they could not prove that he (the Archbishop) was even aware of its existence,—that he never approved of pictures of God the Father[3].

To this conclusive defence his enemies replied, that he did not find those historical representations complete and entire, (and here, let it be remarked, Laud never asserted so,) that his confessing he did not, amounted to an admission of his guilt; that in the stained windows, he himself gave directions to the workmen; that these representations were in the

[1] Institut. lib. i. c. xi. § 12. [2] P. 64, 65.

[3] Rushworth, part ii. vol. .p. 2i 74, 275. Troubles and Trials, p. 332, 333, 334.

Missal, and, therefore, he *must* have taken them from it, whether he admitted it or not; that he had perverted Calvin's language, who merely affirms, that he is not so superstitious as to think it altogether unlawful to make any images of men or beasts for a civil use, since painting is the gift of God; and he farther says, in the very same passage, "Purum et legitimum utriusque usum requiro, ne quæ Dominus in suam gloriam, et bonum nostrum nobis contulit, ea non tantum polluantur præpostero abusu, sed in nostram quoque perniciem convertantur. Deum effingi visibili specie nefas esse putamus, quia id vetuit ipse, et fieri sine aliqua gloriæ ejus deformatione non potest;" and, speaking of images in churches he says, "Non judicio aut delecta, sed stulta et inconsiderata cupiditate:"—that the third part of the Homily against the Peril of Idolatry affirms it unlawful to make the picture of Christ, much more to set them up in Churches—that Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Irenæus, Tertullian, Minutius Felix, Origen, &c. expressly assert, that there were no images in the churches of the primitive Christians, —that Lactantius and other primitive Christians assert, that, "without doubt there can be no religion at all wheresoever an image is; and that Epiphanius, in holy indignation, rent the image of Christ, or some saint, which he found in a church depicted on a piece of cloth"—that if the book *De Pudicitia* be Tertullian's, which some doubt, the Archbishop had wrongly quoted him, for his words

are, "Sed a parabolis licebit incipias ubi est ovis perdita a Domino acquisita, &c., picturæ calicem *vestrorum*, &c.," not *nostrorum;* and that this Father hath written a whole book against Idolatry, which he has entitled *De Idololatria*—that the setting up of glass windows is not simply high treason by the statute, but as it may tend to subvert our religion, laws, and introduce Popery, it may amount to high treason—that the statute 3 Ed. VI. c. x. extends not only to images, but to glass windows, as do also the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, and the statute of 3 James I. c. v., which reckons them among the relics of Popery, and enjoins them to be defaced [1].

Now, it were an easy matter, indeed, to prove the absurdity of this reply, but I conceive that it is so self-evident as to be needless. Perhaps the reader will affirm that these ridiculous charges are unworthy of notice; in this I agree, but it must be recollected, that it was in consequence of these the Archbishop was murdered. In this manner the trial proceeded, the Archbishop never being allowed to examine the pleadings of his antagonists, but having merely time for a short and unpremeditated reply. Miserable sophistry it was to attempt to prove high treason from such premises. But if the Archbishop had indeed repaired his chapel windows from a Missal, where was the crime? It appears

[1] Rushworth, ut sup. p. 276, 277. Canterburie's Doome, p. 59—62.

that such a repair was unlawful, because the windows had been defaced at the Reformation; as if the actions of an ignorant and fanatical rabble are never to be called in question. The statutes to which the enthusiasts referred are, for their argument, singularly unfortunate. That of 1st Elizabeth refers to 3d Edward VI. but it orders things to remain as they were when that statute was enacted; and the act of Edward VI. commands only the destruction of images in wood, stone, or alabaster, but says nothing of stained windows, and even expressly enjoins the preservation of images and monuments, if these were not saints, or worshipped as such. These acts, therefore, were in Laud's favour. It was mere sophistry to talk of Elizabeth's injunctions; for the *act* was passed in 1558, the Injunctions in 1559; and the latter, after commanding the destruction of images, enjoins, "preserving, nevertheless, and *repairing*, both the walls and glass windows." As to the Homily against Peril of Idolatry, it is there expressly declared, that "Images, or pictures in glass, or hangings, are expressly and truly said not to be idols *till they are worshipped.*"

II. The next charge brought against the Archbishop was superstition in the consecration of churches, and the two famous instances were adduced of St. Catherine Cree, and St. Giles' in the Fields. "This," says Pyrnne, "was wholly abolished upon the Reformation of religion in King Edward's days, by the express statutes of 3d and 4th Edward VI. c. i. 5th and 6th Edward VI. c. i.; and

after that by the statutes of 1st of Elizabeth, c. ii. and 8th Elizabeth, c. i. which abrogate all rites, ceremonies, and consecrations whatsoever, but those *comprised in the Book of Common Prayer and Ordination of Ministers*[1]." This last admission is singularly unfortunate for Prynne. He affirms, too, that it was contrary to the opinion of Bishop Pilkington of Durham, and of Archbishop Parker[2]. But these prelates condemn Popish consecrations, as appears from the very passages to which Prynne has referred.

The consecration of altars, chalices, &c. the dedication of churches to saints and angels, and commemoration feasts, were all alleged as crimes by the Archbishop's accusers[3]. To these things the Archbishop replied, that consecration was first practised by Moses, who hallowed the tabernacle, and also by Solomon, who set apart the temple;—that Christian churches were consecrated when they were first built, which was in the reign of Constantine; and Eusebius, who flourished A.D. 310[4], mentions that of Tyre:—that the Feast of the Dedication, (John x. 22.) was the anniversary of the Dedication, Ezra vi. 16, 17.—that Archbishop Parker condemns Popish consecrations only[5], and that he (Laud) made use of Bishop Andrews' Consecration Book.

These facts the Primate's accusers could not well

[1] Canterburie's Doome, p. 114. [2] Ibid. p. 115, 116.
[3] Ibid. p. 115. 497. [4] Eusebius, Hist. lib. x. c. iii.
[5] Antiquitates Ecclesiæ Britannicæ, p. 85—87.

deny; they met them, therefore, by a direct assertion, that consecration was absolute Popery, and they objected to all his illustrations from the Jewish history. They declared that the book of Bishop Andrews was only another form of the Missal, and that, therefore, it was Popish; though they chose to forget, and indeed would not have admitted, that there is no lack of sound doctrine in the Romish Missal, though it be mixed with abundance of error. Finally, they rejected all the Archbishop's illustrations as unworthy of credit. It is evident, however, that he was right in his principle, though he may have carried it to excess; but it is to be remarked, that he distinctly denied the representations which had been given of the consecration of St. Catherine Cree and St. Giles' in the Fields.

III. The removal of the communion table, and the alteration of its name to *altar*, were the next grounds of complaint. Having already animadverted on this subject, a few remarks are only introduced here, to shew the gross injustice of arraigning a man on a charge of life and death for the interpretation of language, which in every case is arbitrary. The Archbishop's accusers objected first to the term *altar*, yet what does it simply mean? An elevated place, on which the ancients used to celebrate the mysteries of their religion, (and, be it remembered, the Eucharist was anciently termed an *holy mystery,)* derived from αλδω, and the Latin *altitudo:*

hence *ara*, an *altar*, is frequently used to signify a lofty place, the top stone, rocks, or eminences[1]. In truth, the word *altar*, in ecclesiastical phraseology, means nothing more than table; and, therefore, Laud's accusers, in their disputations on the difference between *altar* and *table*, were arguing against objections they themselves raised; and the assertion of Bishop Williams[2], that the name *table* was solely used for 250 years after Christ, is completely erroneous. For St. Ignatius terms the communion table εν θυσιαστηριον[3], (from θυσιαζω, to sacrifice, to immolate,) which means *altare, sacrarium*; as do also Irenæus and Origen. The communion table is termed by Tertullian *ara Dei et altare;* and St. Cyprian uses the words without any distinction. These writers lived in the second and third centuries. As to the others of that age, Lactantius, Origen, &c. who affirm that Christians had neither temples nor altars, they manifestly refer to the heathen edifices, and altars on which animal sacrifices were offered; for they tell us of their own θυσιαστηριον, and their βωμος αναιμακτος, *bloodless altar*, which bear hard against the Popish notion of the mass, or *unbloody sacrifice*, as the Papists choose to term it; and even when the fathers employ τραπεζα, *mensa*, a significant adjective

[1] Hence Virgil, Æn. i. 113. "Saxa, vocant Itali mediis quæ fluctibus *aras*."

[2] "The Holy Table, Name, and Thing."

[3] Ignat. Ep. ad Ephes. n. 5.

is always used, such as *αγιασμα, μυστικος*, the former especially by Eusebius [1].

It is evident, then, that the charge of high treason made against the Archbishop on this head was altogether absurd, and that the arguments his enemies adduced are totally untenable and inconclusive. Let us, however, attend to the other division of this charge, namely, the removal of the altar or communion table from the middle to the east end of the church, which was declared to be an enormous crime. It was stated that the altar stood anciently in the choir, or middle part of the Jewish and Christian churches, which has been proved by Bucer, Jewel, and others; and that this was their original position in England is proved from the testimonies of the Venerable Bede and Archbishop Austin of Canterbury,—that our Lord celebrated the eucharist at an ordinary table, (which is the Scotch notion, and hence the Presbyterian argument for that peculiar attitude),—that the word *choir* has its name from those who stood round the altar, —that those who stood *round* the altar were anciently prayed for, and, therefore, it could not be close to the wall—finally, that the injunctions of Elizabeth enjoined the communion table to be fixed where the altars formerly stood, which Bede and Austin prove to have been in the choir,—that this position is set forth by the Rubric and Canon lxxxii.

[1] Bingham's Eccles. Antiquities, vol. iii. edit. London, 1711. p. 188—192.

of 1603; consequently, its removal was a Popish innovation, and high treason!

Now, in all these assertions, there is a cluster of the most unfounded and ridiculous statements. It matters not whether they are set down logically or not, but such were a few of their proofs of high treason. The Archbishop never attempted to *restore* altars. The antiquity of their position in the chancel is proved on the clearest evidence. "We find it described in a letter of Theodosius and Valentinian," says Bingham, "at the end of the Council of Ephesus, and inserted also in the Theodosian Code, where, speaking of churches as places of refuge, they divide them into these three parts:— 1. The θυσιαστηριον, the altar part, or sanctuary. 2. The ευκτηριον του λαου τετραγωνον, the four-squared oratory of the people; and 3. The remaining part from that to the outer doors of the church[1]." These divisions, here given on the most undoubted evidence by this learned writer, are to the following effect:—the first, or chancel, anciently called βημα, or tribunal, a word of various significations; sometimes denoting merely the reading-desk, and sometimes the altar, sometimes the seat or throne of the bishop and presbyters, and sometimes the whole space where the altar stood[2]. In this last sense it is used by St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, the former Father intimating, that it was approached by an

[1] Bingham's Ecclesiastical Antiquities, vol. iii. c. v. p. 163, 164.

[2] Ibid. vol. iii. c. vi. p. 177.

ascent. The Greeks called the *βῆμα*, or tribunal, *αγιον*, or holy, hence the altar is termed *αγιον αγιων*, the holy of holies, which term is employed by Eusebius [1], and also *αγιασμα*, the word employed in the Septuagint. The Latins termed it *sacrarium*, the sanctuary; it was also termed by the Greeks the altar-part (*θυσιαστηριον*).

Such being the case in the apostolic and primitive ages, let us now observe the nature of the Puritan and Presbyterian objections. The first Council of Bracara prohibits laymen from entering the sanctuary to communicate. In like manner, the Council of Varson, and the fourth General Council of Carthage, and the Councils of Laodicea and Trullo. The Council of Laodicea, moreover, forbids women to come within the *θυσιαστηριον*, or altar-part, and enjoined none but the *ιερατικοι*, or clergy, to communicate there. So also the Council of Trullo; and hence the *altar-part* received the names of *ἄβατα* and *ἄδυτα* by the Greek writers, and *adyta* by the Latins—*inaccessible*, that is, inaccessible to the people. Here, then, let us notice the canon; as a prohibition to communicate in the altar-part did not mean that the people were not to enter the chancel at all, but the altar or *bema* was railed in, as Eusebius declares [2]; and hence it was called *cancelli* by the Latins, from which our English word chancel. In some places it is also termed the

[1] Euseb. lib. x. c. iv. p. 381.

[2] Ibid. lib. x. c. iv. *ως αν ειη τοις πολλοις αβατα, απο ξυλου περιεφραττε δικτοις*, &c.

chorus[1], hence the word quire or chancel. Thus, the altar-part was that within the rails[2], from which the people were always excluded; and Socrates, Theodoret, Sozomen, and others relate, that even the Emperor Theodosius was excluded by St. Ambrose from the altar-part[3], and that the people always communicated *without the rails*. The second division of the church was termed the ναος, hence *nave*, or *oratory;* the third, the *naithex*, or porch. So much, then, for the assertion of Laud's enemies, that the communion table stood *anciently* in the body of the church.

Nor was the inference which they drew from the Venerable Bede and Austin of Canterbury more fortunate or conclusive. For in the ancient churches the communion table always stood in the upper end of the chancel, but seldom, if ever, close to the wall. The throne or seat of the bishop, and those of the presbyters, were placed behind the altar. It was the same in Britain during the days of Austin and the Venerable Bede; and hence the allusion of the former to the sacred *mensa* as *in medio constituta*, that is, in the middle of the chancel, or choir, not in the nave; or rather, in the middle of the altar-part, (βημα, or θυσιαστηριον) which was railed in, and none admitted to enter but the bishops, pres-

[1] Conc. Tolet. iv. c. 17. Sacerdotes et Levitæ ante altare communicent, in choro clerus, extra chorum populus.

[2] Mede's Commentary on the Apocalypse, p. 479.

[3] Socrat. lib. i. c. 11. Theodor. lib. i. c. 14. Sozomen, lib. vii. c. 24.

byters, and deacons. "This explanation once admitted," says Grant, "all the learning of the managers displayed in their *modus coronæ*, and their bishops encircling the altars, and their people standing round about the altars, as introduced to prove the altar to have stood anciently in the body of the church, is but idle prattle wasted in the air."

I may add a single remark on the charge of innovations brought against the Archbishop, respecting Elizabeth's Injunctions. They admitted that these Injunctions commanded the communion table to be placed where the altar *formerly stood.* Here they were guilty of a most egregious contradiction. This will be sufficiently proved by quoting these Injunctions. "Whereas, in many parts of the realm the altars be removed, and tables placed for the administration of the holy sacrament, according to law; and in other places the altars be not removed, in the order whereof, saving for uniformity, there seemeth no matter of great moment, so that the sacrament be duly and reverently ministered, yet, for observation of one uniformity throughout the realm, and for better imitation of the law in that behalf, it is ordered, that no altar be taken down, but by oversight of the curate and churchwardens; and that the holy table in every church be decently made, and set in the place *where the altar stood,* and there commonly covered as thereto belongeth; and when the sacrament is to be distributed, to be placed *within the chancel,* so that the minister may conveniently be heard, and the communicants

communicate with him; after the communion done from time to time the same holy table to be placed where it stood before."

It therefore appears, that the Archbishop's enemies were, in this instance, guilty of glaring falsehood, as they also were in their interpretation of the 82d Canon of 1603, which says, "either within the chancel or within the church." They had indeed adopted the idea, that, as masses were always said in the chancel of the Popish churches, therefore it was Popery to remove the table thither; but this is absurd, for masses could be said as well in the nave, as in the chancel. It is evident, however, that the Presbyterian posture of irreverence, tumult, and insubordination at the holy table had completely divested the zealots of all respect for antiquity. The unhappy primacy of Abbott had encouraged many disorders, and bitterly did Laud atone for that prelate's imprudence. It is unnecessary to notice the charge of Laud's accusers against the *furniture* of the altar. It is too ridiculous to be received for a moment. In fine, the Archbishop's love of order and solemnity in public worship was reckoned by his enemies a prodigious crime; as actually inferring high treason. Wretched indeed were those times, in which men could so wantonly sport with life, and inflict at pleasure the punishment of death, thus glutting their eyes on the murder of those whom they daringly designated "state malefactors," alleging pretended crimes, which, in truth, were no crimes, but, at the utmost, themes of

literary research, by the most contemptible, contradictory, and fallacious arguments.

IV. The bowing at the name of Jesus was reckoned another heinous crime, as "subverting the laws and religion of the realm." With this were coupled other alleged charges of *high treason,* such as standing at the Gloria Patri, reading the second service at the communion table, church music, (to which those sages had a rooted antipathy,) and the wearing of copes. The Archbishop defended bowing from various passages of Scripture, from the practice of the primitive Church, from the 12th Injunction of Elizabeth, and from the 18th Canon of 1603; the 24th Canon of that year also enjoins the wearing of copes; the use and necessity of church music require no comment.

The Primate's accusers, however, were by no means satisfied with this explanation. This part, I presume, was specially conducted by Prynne, who had written a tract against those primitive customs. They declared that bowing at the name of Jesus encouraged transubstantiation; that it was only introduced in 1431; they now pretended that the Canons of 1603 were not valid, because they had not been ratified by Parliament; moreover, they were now supplanted by the Homilies and Book of Common Prayer; that standing at the Gloria Patri was introduced with the Mass; that there was no injunction to read the second service when there was no communion; that the table was designed only for the communion; that there is no authority for copes in

the Books of Common Prayer and Ordination; that the Canon of 1603 enjoins the chief minister only to wear one at the communion, but the Archbishop had commanded them to be worn by all clergymen.

These absurd positions might easily have been refuted; but the Archbishop was prohibited from making a reply. Setting aside the proofs from Scripture and from the Fathers, he might have informed them, that if there was no command to read the second service, when there was no communion, in the Canons of 1571 and 1603, there was no prohibition, and the same may be said about the wearing of copes; nevertheless, with respect to the latter, the statute of 1548 enjoined hoods to be worn by all graduates; in 1551, an act was passed repealing this, in a degree; but in the first year of Elizabeth the statute of 1548 was confirmed, and the following year, 1559, ratified the wearing of those ecclesiastical garments which had been worn in Edward VI.'s reign. The 58th Canon of 1603 expressly commands the wearing of surplices and hoods in all churches, and by all the clergy.

It is unnecessary to dwell on some of the other charges brought against the Archbishop, because they have already come partially under our observation. These were, that he had encouraged Popish and Arminian errors:—that he had refused to license certain orthodox books:—that he had persecuted Puritans for preaching against Popery and Arminianism:—and that he had endeavoured to reconcile the Churches of England and Rome.

The last charge excited in him a virtuous indignation. He repelled the charge with disdain, and in a spirit of poignant satire. "I have converted," said he, "several from Popery; I have framed an oath against it; I have made a canon against it; I have written a book against it; I have held a controversy against it; I have been twice offered a cardinal's hat, and refused it; I have been twice in danger of my life from a Popish plot; I have endeavoured to reconcile the Lutherans and the Calvinists; and, therefore, I have endeavoured to introduce Popery! As to particulars, the titles bestowed by the Universities were trifles; let it be proved that I assumed Popish power. The Queen's conversion was prayed for in a factious manner, and in a spirit of bitterness. I do believe the Church of Rome to be a true Church. She never erred in fundamentals, for fundamentals are in the creed, and she denies it not. Were she not a true Church, it were hard with the Church of England, since from her the English Bishops derive their apostolical succession. She is therefore a true *but not an orthodox Church.* Salvation may be found in her communion, and her religion and ours are one in the great essentials. I am not bound to believe each detached phrase in the Homilies, and I do not think they assert the Pope to be Antichrist, yet it cannot be proved that I ever denied him to be so. As to the charge of unchurching foreign Protestants, I certainly said generally, according to St. Jerome, No bishop, no church: and the Preface to the Book of Ordination

sets forth that the three orders came from the Apostles. After all, what was my crime with respect to the French and Dutch Churches in England? To insist that those alone of the second generation, born in this country, should receive the English Liturgy! I never had correspondence with Popish priests, and it can be shewn that I informed the King of the late plot, as soon as I myself had intelligence of it."

To this noble and admirable defence, the adversaries of the Primate made a miserable reply. They could not deny that he had endeavoured to suppress Popery, and yet they affirmed that he was a Papist. They said that the Church of Rome was abominable, corrupt, and damnable; that its clergy were not true ministers, and that, in short, it was Antichrist.

On the 29th of July, 1644, after a continuance of three months, during which, as has been said, the Archbishop was heard twenty days in his own defence, the trial concluded. No man, after a candid perusal of the whole proceedings, will presume to say, that this venerable Primate had even common justice: and his enemies utterly failed to prove that any of his actions were treasonable, according to the laws and constitution of the kingdom. Four things were clearly proved, 1. That in those charges on religion, the Archbishop was not only right himself, but had the Scriptures, and the sentiments of the Church in every age on his side. 2. That, although he had not been right, it could not be proved that his design was to intro-

duce Popery. 3. That, though he had in reality so attempted, it was not high treason; and, 4. That, on the civil charges, as many of the acts imputed to him were not his individually, but those of the government, it was unjust to condemn him for them individually; and, moreover, as not one of the civil charges amounted in itself to high treason, no combination of such charges could establish that crime.

On the 21st of September following, the Archbishop was permitted to make what he terms his recapitulation. He thanked the Peers for the patience with which they had heard him; he trusted to their justice in pronouncing him innocent of crime, and to their clemency in making due allowance for the common frailties of man. He besought them to review the charges with care, and with the respect due to his rank, age, long imprisonment, sufferings, and patience in his affliction. He complained that he had not sufficient time to prepare his defence, and trusted that a day would be appointed for the hearing of his counsel before sentence was pronounced. He reminded them of the malicious seizure of his Diary and papers by his enemy, Prynne, and also the seizure of even his prayer-book, though he blessed God there was no disloyalty in the one, nor Popery in the other. He reminded them of the crafty and unjust methods pursued to procure evidence against him; he maintained that the charges were general and vague. Hasty language, the acts of other men, the decrees

of courts and councils, had all been imputed to him as crimes, as were also the repairing of St. Paul's, and reforming the statutes of the University of Oxford, for which he conceived that he deserved praise instead of blame. He had been overwhelmed, he said, by 150 witnesses, schismatics and sectaries, some of them three, four, six times appearing against him, contrary to the injunctions of the civil law, which expressly declares, that "the judges should so moderate things, that no man should be oppressed by the multitude of witnesses, which is a kind of proof, too, that they who so do, distrust the truth and goodness of their cause [1]." He reminded them of what had been advanced by his enemies at the bar on the 16th of last April, "that they did not urge any of these particular actions as treason against him, but the result of them all together amounted to treason;" which he maintained was absurd. "And now, my Lords," said he in conclusion, "I do in all humility lay myself low at God's mercy-seat, to do with me as he pleases, and, under God, I shall rely upon your Lordships' justice, honour, and clemency, of which I cannot doubt, and without being farther tedious to your Lordships, (who have with honourable patience heard me through this long and tedious trial,) I

[1] Judices moderentur, &c., ne effrænata potestate ad vexandos homines superflua multitudo testium protrahatur. Adde et hanc rationem, quod qui prædicta licentia abutuntur, veniunt in suspicionem, quod non satis confidunt veritate. Gloss. H. L. 21. Tit. xxi.

shall conclude with that which St. Augustine said to Romanianus, a man, like myself, who had experienced prosperous and adverse fortune, 'If the Providence of God reaches down to us (as most certainly it doth), it must so be done with thee, and so with me also, as it is done.' And under that Providence, which will, I doubt not, work to the best to the soul that loves God, I repose myself [1]."

On the 11th day of October the Archbishop's counsel were heard: the defence was drawn up by the famous Matthew Hale, though it was delivered by Hearne [2]. The argument proceeded on the law of treason, and investigation of the statute of 25th Edward III. and of statutes passed in the reigns of succeeding monarchs [3]. After this the Archbishop had a few days rest; but, on the 22d of October, his apartments in the Tower were again searched, and shortly after, on the 28th of October, a petition was presented to the House of Commons, at the instigation of Prynne, from the rabble about London, praying for justice against *Delinquents;* and the Archbishop alone was mentioned with the Bishop of Ely. On the 2d of November he was

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 412—421.

[2] "The Lord Chancellor Finch told me," says Wharton, "that this argument was not Mr. Hearne's, though he delivered it, for he could not argue, but it was Mr. Hale's, afterwards Lord Chief Justice; and he said farther, that being then a younger lawyer, he stood behind Mr. Hearne, when he spoke at the bar of the Lords' House, and took notes of it."—Note, apud Troubles and Trials, p. 422.

[3] Troubles and Trials, p. 423—431.

brought to the bar of the House of Commons, and again on the 11th, when he made an admirable and eloquent defence. He went over all the charges against him in a clear and comprehensive manner. He reminded them of his great age, and the feebleness of his body; that, in the course of nature, his death could not be far distant. "It cannot," said he, "but be a great grief unto me, to stand at these years thus charged before you. Yet give me leave to say thus much without offence: whatsoever errors or faults I may have committed by the way, in any of my proceedings, through human infirmity, (for who is he that hath not offended, and broken some statute laws, too, by ignorance, or misapprehension, or forgetfulness, at some sudden time of action?) yet, if God bless me with so much memory, I shall die with these words in my mouth, that I never intended, much less endeavoured, the subversion of the laws of the kingdom, nor the bringing in of Popish superstition upon the true Protestant religion, established by law in this kingdom[1]."

The Archbishop requested the House to hear his counsel, but this was refused. On November 13, Brown, one of the opposite counsel, replied to his answer, on which occasion the Archbishop was summoned to attend. After hearing this, he was ordered to the Tower, and immediately after his departure, *without hearing his counsel,* or any

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 432—440.

argument, he was voted guilty of high treason. "And yet," says he, "when I came that day to the House, all men, and many members of the House themselves, did much magnify my answer before given. I forbear to set down the language, because it was too high, as no time can be fit for vanity, at least such a time for me as the present; and vain I must needs be thought, should I here relate what was told me from many and good hands; but it seems the clamour prevailed against me[1]."

Thus ended this most unjust and illegal trial; in which the Archbishop is allowed even by his enemies to have conducted his defence in an admirable manner. Even Prynne, his implacable enemy, whom Wood justly terms, "the stigmatized and crop-eared Presbyterian," bears testimony to his conduct. "And to give him his due," says that incendiary, "he made as full, as gallant, as pithy a defence of so bad a cause, and spake as much for himself, as was possible for the wit of man to invent, and that with the greatest art, sophistry, vivacity, oratory, audacity, and confidence, without the least blush, or acknowledgment of guilt in any thing[2]." So resolved were his enemies on his destruction, that when the trial was proceeding, and it seemed hopeless to prove him guilty of high treason, a member of the Commons replied to one of his friends, who lamented his situation, that were he never so innocent, he must be condemned for their own

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 441. [2] Canterburie's Doome, p. 462.

sakes; and the citizens of London also declared, though he had defended himself well, he must suffer *for the honour of the House*[1]." There was not one of the religious *crimes* imputed to him, but was openly practised without control after the Restoration. "But when hatred doth accuse, and malice persecute," says Antony Wood, "and prepossession sit upon the bench, God help the innocent. They called him often to the bar, both before and after; caused a strict inquisition into all his actions, winnowed him like wheat, and sifted him to the very bran, which was, you know, the devil's work; they had against him all advantages of power and malice, and witnesses at hand on all occasions; but still they found his answers and resolution of so good a temper, his innocence and integrity of so bright a dye, that as they knew not how to dismiss him with credit, so neither could they find a way to condemn him with justice. And though their consciences could tell them that he had done nothing which deserved either death or bonds, yet, either to reward or oblige the Scots, who would not think themselves secure while his head was on, they were resolved to bring him to a speedy end; only they did desire, if possible, to lay the odium of the murder upon the common people."

In addition, however, to the general injustice of the trial, this noble Prelate was treated by his accusers with studied indignity. Sergeant Wylde,

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 441.

[2] Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 132.

who conducted the prosecution, after having aggravated to the utmost his alleged offences, concluded by saying, "that he was guilty of so many and notorious treasons, so evidently destructive of the commonwealth, that he marvelled the people did not tear him in pieces as he proceeded between his barge and the Parliament House." Yet this was spoken *before* he was condemned, and without any censure from the judges. He was exposed every day to the ignoble gaze of the fanatical rabble; compelled to wait for hours among menials in an anti-room; checked and interrupted in the course of his defence; while he was doomed to hear all the scurrility which his enemies uttered against him. Yet, he preserved his dignity, and disdained a mean submission; thus verifying the remark of the ancient sage, that to see a good and a great man struggling with misfortune, is a sight on which the gods might look with complacency. On one occasion, while he made some remarks on one or two of the witnesses, he was insultingly told to speak respectfully of gentlemen, aldermen, and men of rank. "That is nothing," was his firm and noble reply. "Gentlemen, and men of all conditions are separatists, and there is not a separatist in England, but his hand is against me." Again, when Nicolas, one of the law managers, bestowed on him the epithet of "pander to the whore of Babylon;"—"Good Master Nicolas," replied the Primate, "pray do not dispense with all whores but the whore of Babylon." The reply was in point.

It happened that one of this enthusiast's chief witnesses was a vile and notorious procurer.

From the consideration of this trial it appears, that if Laud was innocent, the guilt and infamy of the Puritans were of the deepest dye. It is needless, however, to extend these remarks. In the affecting "History of his own Troubles and Trials," the reader will perceive the injustice of his enemies; indeed, a defence of this part of the "tender mercies" of the Puritans, is now given up even by their admirers. The time is surely at hand, when this illustrious prelate will receive the honour and veneration which he so well deserves. Monuments have been raised and epitaphs inscribed to the memory of men, many of them, doubtless, the renown and the glory of their several times; some of them, nevertheless, having doubtful claims to these distinctions. But he of whom it has been justly said, that, had he lived, venerable as he was at this time in years, and still more venerable for his learning, piety, and the sanctity of his Episcopal character, "St. Paul's cathedral had silenced the fame of ancient wonders, our English clergy had been the glory of the world, the Bodleian Library at Oxford had daily outstript the Vatican, and his public structures excelled the Escurial,"—even he is in this enlightened age, the object of contumely (I had almost said execration), not so much to sectarians and schismatics, which may excite little surprise, but to the affected and self-styled *Evangelists* of that Church, of which he was the illustrious orna-

ment, and for his attachment to which he was condemned as a traitor to his country. Yet I greatly fear, that this vain-glorious affectation of liberality contains in reality the essence of schism; and at least it has its reward, in securing the ignoble applause of wandering and prejudiced zealots, who mistake a certain phraseology for true religion, and appearance of zeal and earnestness as those in reality. To such men it may be said, in the words of Holy Scripture, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." Let the industrious Wood, with all his partialities, bear testimony to the virtues of this noble Primate. "Whosoever," says he, "shall read over the *Diary of his life*, penned by himself for private use, but purposely published by his inveterate enemy, William Prynne, with his rascally notes and diabolical reflections thereon, purposely to render him more odious to the common people, (followed therein by another villain [1],) will find that he was a man of such eminent virtues, such an exemplary piety towards God, such an unwearied fidelity to his gracious sovereign, of such a public soul towards this Church and State, of so fixed a constancy in what he undertook, and one so little biassed in his private interests, that Plurarch, if he were alive, would be much troubled to find a sufficient parallel wherewith to match him, in all the lineaments of perfect virtue."

[1] Lewis Du Moulin, in his "Patronus Bonæ Fidei, in Causa Puritanorum contra Hierarchicos Anglicanos." London, 1672, 8vo. in cap. vel. lib. Specimen contra Durellum, p. 62, 63, &c.

The last, however, the closing scene yet remains, and more accurately and justly will the Archbishop's character be estimated, when it is known, that, on the very day he was condemned, the Parliament passed an act, prohibiting in all times coming, *the use of the Book of Common Prayer.*

" Nor deem, when Learning her last prize bestows,
The glittering eminence exempt from foes.
See, when the vulgar 'scapes, despised or awed,
Rebellion's vengeful talons seize on LAUD.
From meaner minds tho' smaller fines content,
The plundered palace or sequestered rent.
Mark'd out by dangerous parts he meets the shock,
And fatal learning leads him to the block.
Around his tomb let Art and Genius weep,
But hear his death, ye blockheads, hear and sleep."

DR. JOHNSON.

CHAPTER XXIII.

1644—5.

Condemnation of the Archbishop by the Commons to die as a traitor—Reluctance of the Peers to sanction the sentence——The pardon of the King disregarded—Injustice of the sentence—Alteration of the sentence to beheading—The Archbishop prepares for death—His conduct on the night before his execution—He is led out to the scaffold—His address to the spectators—His dying discourse—His prayers on the scaffold—His devotion and magnanimity—His conduct on the scaffold—Inhuman behaviour of his enemies—His last prayer—His death—Conclusion.

The trial of the Archbishop was now ended, and it remained with his enemies to decide his punishment. His death they had indeed resolved upon, but it was a difficult thing to complete the tragedy under pretence of justice.

It is said, that, during some periods of the Archbishop's imprisonment, his enemies had afforded him opportunities to escape, of which he refused to take advantage. Certain it is, that while his confinement was severe or gentle, according to the movements of the Scots in England, he had some opportunities of escape afforded him, of which a few of his accusers would have been glad if he had availed himself; but having gone so far as they did, they

had resolved to complete their iniquity and injustice by bringing him to the scaffold. The Archbishop indeed says, that after his being kept three years a *close prisoner*, he was brought to his trial; but here, perhaps, he speaks generally, that he was confined, as will appear from the following facts.

The celebrated Dr. Edward Pococke, the most profound Oriental scholar of his age, was nominated by the Archbishop to the Arabic Lectureship which he had founded at Oxford in 1636. Pococke, when he received the appointment, was at Aleppo, but he hastened home, and on the 8th of August that year, he opened the lecture. Shortly afterwards, however, he was dispatched by the Archbishop to the East to procure Manuscripts, in which he was aided by the famous Patriarch Cyril of Constantinople, who was the Primate's friend and correspondent. In 1639, he received letters from the Archbishop, pressing him to return, and accordingly he embarked at Constantinople for Italy, and proceeded thence to Paris, where he met with Hugo Grotius, whom he informed of his intention to translate his Treatise on the Truth of the Christian Religion into Arabic. But when Pococke arrived in London, in 1640, he found his illustrious patron committed to the Tower. Hastening thither, he had an interview with the Archbishop, to whom he delivered a message from Grotius. The Primate's committal had excited a considerable sensation at Paris, especially among the learned, and Grotius, in particular, lamented his misfortunes. When he was

himself, at one time, in the like circumstances, by the persecution of the Calvinists, he had probably saved his life by escaping from the place of his confinement in the fortress of Louvestein, in Holland [1]. He therefore enjoined Pococke to inform the Archbishop, "that it was his (Grotius') humble request and advice, that his Grace would find out some way, if possible, to escape out of the hands he was now in, and pass to some place beyond seas, there to preserve himself till better times; at least to obtain some present security from the malice of his bitter enemies and the rage of a deluded people." Pococke, moreover, informed the Archbishop that Grotius had particularly recommended this course, and had advised him so to counsel him, as soon as he obtained access to him; and he hoped that no opportunity would be lost in carrying the suggestion into effect.

It was true, indeed, that the Archbishop was not without examples to induce him to take this step. The Lord Keeper Finch and Secretary Windebank had both saved themselves by a timely flight, and the noble historian asserts that it was by the connivance of their enemies. But the Primate no sooner heard it, than he gave it his decided opposition. "I thank my good friend, Hugo Grotius," said he, "for the care he has thus expressed of my safety, but I can by no means be persuaded to com-

[1] He was conveyed out in a chest, under the pretence that it was full of books. Baugny's Life of Grotius, p. 78, 79.

ply with his advice. An escape, indeed, is feasible enough; yea, it is, I believe, the very thing which my enemies desire; for every day an opportunity for it is presented to me, a passage being left free, in all likelihood for this very purpose, that I should endeavour to take advantage of it; but they shall not be gratified by me in what they appear to long for. I am almost seventy years old, and shall I now go about to prolong a miserable life, by the trouble and shame of flying? And were I willing to be gone, whither should I fly? Should I go to France, or any other Popish country, it would be to give some seeming ground to that charge of Popery they have endeavoured with so much industry, and so little reason, to fasten upon me. But if I should get into Holland, I should expose myself to the insults of those sectaries there, to whom I am odious, and have every Anabaptist come, and pull me by the beard. No, I am resolved not to think of flight, but, continuing where I am, patiently expect and bear what a good and wise Providence hath appointed for me, of what kind soever it may be [1]."

I return, however, to the Archbishop. After the conclusion of his trial, it appears that he must either be left to the verdict of the House of Peers, or to that of a Middlesex Jury; but, fearing that the former would not comply with their wishes, his

[1] Dr. Twell's Life of Dr. Edward Pococke, p. 20.

prosecutors would not venture on the latter; for, though they would doubtless have impanelled a jury to find a bill, yet, by a clause in the attainder of the Earl of Strafford, they had bound themselves not to hold those actions as high treason on any future time for which he was condemned. They resolved, therefore, to complete their injustice, by making a cruel and almost unparalleled outrage on all law, by passing an ordinance themselves for his attainder [1].

The Archbishop had been brought to the bar of the House of Commons on the 11th of November, but this, as Heylin remarks, was merely "for fashion's sake; not without magnifying the favour of giving him leave to shew some reason why the bill should not pass against him." The ordinance was accordingly passed with only one dissenting voice, and transmitted to the Peers; but, whether from "some sparks of humanity," from a fear of the injustice of this ordinance, as dangerous to themselves, or because some of them, who had not been present during his trial, were ignorant of the charges and evidence given against him, the debate on this ordinance was delayed. On the 4th of December it was ordered in the House of Peers, that "all the books, writings, and evidence, which concerned the trial, should be brought before the Lords in Parlia-

[1] Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 133, 134. Heylin, p. 492, 493. Rushworth, part iii. vol ii. p. 834. Troubles and Trials, p. 441, 442.

ment," that they might consider the whole charges severally before they came to a decision [1].

This was by no means relished by the Commons. Fearing that the Archbishop would yet escape their vengeance, some of the leaders began to insinuate, that, if they began to delay, a bill would be introduced into the Lower House, to deprive them of all their places of trust and emolument in the army. This, however, had no effect. On the 22d of November, the Earl of Pembroke, animated by the most ungrateful hatred towards the Archbishop, had publicly termed him in the House of Peers "rascal" and "villain," and indulged in the most indecent abuse; informing them, that if they delayed their consent to the ordinance, the citizens would assemble, fall upon them, and call for justice, as they did in the case of the Earl of Strafford. The Commons, also, had devised another expedient, which was to unite the two Houses, by which they were certain the Peers would be outvoted [2].

The House of Peers, however, proceeded to examine every article of the charges, and, on the 24th of December, informed the Commons, that they had found the Archbishop guilty of the charge relating to matters of fact; but they desired time to consider whether those matters, in point of law, amounted to treason. On the delivery of this message, a com-

[1] Rushworth, ut sup. p. 834. Heylin, p. 493, 494. Wood, vol. iii. col. 134.

[2] Wood, vol. iii. col. 134. Heylin, p. 494. Troubles and Trials, p. 441, 442, 443.

mittee was appointed by the Commons to satisfy the House of Peers, and on the 4th of January the attainder was ratified, and it was decreed that he should suffer death as a traitor. On the 6th of January, it was ordered by both Houses that the Archbishop be led out to execution on the 10th of January, and that the manner of his death should be that which is usually inflicted on traitors [1].

To the honour of the House of Peers it must be recorded, that while there was only one dissenting voice in the Commons against this infamous procedure, no more than six of the Peers concurred with the sentence, which was passed chiefly by the violence and threats of the Earl of Pembroke, and by the furious conduct of Stroud, one of the Commons; ("he that made," says Wood, "all the bloody motions,") who threatened them, in one of his messages from the Lower House, that a petition would be presented from London, signed by 20,000 persons, to obtain the sanction of that ordinance; and though this threat formed *no part* of his message from the Commons, so completely had the Peers forgotten their dignity, that Stroud was not so much as reproved. The six Peers, who by their concurrence in this transaction have entailed on themselves infamy and disgrace, were Philip Earl of Pembroke, Henry Earl of Kent, William Earl of Salisbury, Oliver Earl of Bolingbroke, Dudley Lord North, and William Lord Grey of Warke, all of

[1] Rushworth, ut sup. p. 834.

them Presbyterians. It was indeed reported that another, the Lord Bruce, a Scottish nobleman, (Earl of Elgin in Scotland,) also gave his vote on this sentence; but that nobleman afterwards denied it, and publicly, on all occasions, expressed his abhorrence and detestation of the whole transaction [1].

On this very day, too, the Parliament abolished the Book of Common Prayer, and established that effusion of Presbyterianism intitled the "Directory for Public Worship," which emanated from the ghostly Westminster Assembly of *Divines*. The coincidence here is remarkable, and from this time we may date the fall of the Church of England; for there is undeniable proof that, while Laud lived, the enthusiasts were afraid to introduce their fanaticism; that he completed that melancholy fall by his blood. With justice, therefore, may Archbishop Laud be said to have died a martyr for the Church of England; the Presbyterians evincing to all the world "how little hopes they had of settling their new form of worship, if the foundation of it were not laid in the blood of this famous prelate, who had so stoutly maintained the Church against all novelty and faction during the whole course of his life."

No attention was paid to a pardon from the King, which was rejected with fanatical and rebellious disdain. To comment on the injustice and iniquity of this sentence is needless. It is a fundamental law of that constitution, in the defence of which those

[1] Heylin, p. 494.

sectarian tyrants pretended to take up arms, and the very first in Magna Charta, that "the Church of England shall be free, and have all its rights and privileges inviolable." It is a fundamental law, "that no person shall be taken or imprisoned *without cause shewn,* or be *detained,* without being brought unto his answer in due form of law:" and this is ratified not only by the Great Charter, but by the Petition of Right. It is a fundamental law "that no man shall be deprived of his freehold or liberty, but by the known laws of the land." It is a fundamental law, "that no man shall be condemned, or put to death, but by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land;"—that is, according to the forms of law, by which any act passed by Parliament, without the King's consent, is undeniably null and void. Finally, it is a fundamental law, set forth in the statute 25th of Edward III. "that if any other cause, which is supposed to be treason, (than that recited in the statute) do happen before any of his Majesty's justices, the justices shall delay their judgment till the case be shewn and declared before the King and his Parliament, whether it ought to be judged treason or not." Yet here we have this prelate condemned, without even the ordinary forms of law, to make way for which act the Spiritual Peers were deprived of their seats in Parliament, and the temporal Lords were forced to assent by demagogues and revolutionary enthusisasts. He was imprisoned *ten weeks* before any charge was produced, and confined for nearly

four years before he knew his accusation—his revenues were seized; he was deprived of his estate, his goods were sold, *before he was convicted;*—condemned to die without the royal assent to the warrant—in fine, led out to execution upon a new charge of treason, "the first that ever suffered death by the *shot of an ordinance,* as he well observed in his dying speech on the scaffold [1]."

The enemies of the Primate had condemned him to die on the gibbet—a mode of punishment which his lofty soul abhorred. With the most magnanimous composure he heard his doom; but the manner of his death was more painful to him than death itself. It was not till after his repeated petition that the sentence was altered to beheading. The House of Lords immediately agreed, but the Commons violently refused till his second petition was presented, praying that, from his being a divine, a bishop, one who had had the honour to sit in the House of Peers, a member of the most honourable Privy Council, &c. he might not be exposed to an ignominious death, but that the mode of his execution might be changed into decapitation. He had petitioned, too, that his chaplains, Doctors Stern, Heywood, and Martin, would be allowed to attend him: which was also in part refused. Dr. Stern was permitted; but two Presbyterian enthusiasts, Marshall and Palmer, were de-

[1] Heylin, p. 495, 496.

puted to tender to him their peculiar consolations, which he nobly declined [1].

And now, when this venerable prelate approached his last moments, a victim to sectarian violence and blood-thirsty ambition, did he evince the animating power of that religion which he had preached and professed. No murmurs or lamentations escaped him: in prayers and supplications he bowed himself before Heaven; though he was long prepared for that blow, which was neither sudden nor unexpected. "So well," says his chaplain, "did he know how to die, (especially by the last and strictest part of his imprisonment,) that by continual fastings, watchings, prayers, and such like acts of Christian humiliation, his flesh was almost changed into spirit, and the whole man so fitted for eternal glory, death brought the bloody but triumphant chariot to convey him thither; and he that had been so long a confessor, could not but think it a release of miseries to be made a *martyr*."

On the night before his death, the Archbishop, after refreshing himself with supper, retired to rest, and sank into a profound slumber till the morning, when he was roused by his servants; so little did he fear his approaching fate. He felt that the malevolence of his enemies was at an end; aged and feeble, his days could not at the farthest be many; and to him death was welcome, since the Church had

[2] Rushworth, Part iii. vol. ii. p. 834.

fallen, since learning had been supplanted by the dark fanaticism of revolutionary zealots. Yet he could not fail to mark well that thirst for his blood which his enemies had manifested: almost verging on the grave, why lead him to the scaffold, when he was under their power, and when imprisonment would soon have released him from their persecuting hatred? Not that he wished to live. To beg his life by humiliating submissions, to drag out an existence, miserable as it must have been to him in that age of sectarian triumph; to have become the sport and mockery of enthusiasts:—his lofty soul disdained the revolting idea. To the brave man death has no terrors; to the innocent no fearful anticipations; to the Christian, harassed by persecution, it is at all times welcome.

On the fatal morning, the 10th day of January, this heroic prelate, with the utmost composure, proceeded to his devotions at an early hour. Thus he continued till Pennington, Lieutenant of the Tower, and other officers appointed by his enemies, came to conduct him to the scaffold. It was erected on Tower Hill. He had already prepared himself for death, and its bitterness was past. He had "committed his cause to Him who judgeth righteously."

A vast concourse of people assembled to behold the last moments of this great man. The mournful procession left the Tower, and the Archbishop was conducted to the scaffold. On his way he was exposed to the abuse of the infamous rabble, who indulged in the most indecent invectives, as if

wishing to embitter the death of a man whom they hated. Yet there were among that motley assemblage those who pitied his sufferings, and whose secret prayers were raised in his behalf; who, remembering him in his prosperity, could not unmoved behold this melancholy vicissitude, affected by those feelings which the sight of greatness in distress fails not to excite. The venerable sufferer himself seemed, least of all, to feel his own misfortunes. His undaunted courage and cheerful countenance, imputed by his friends to his innocence, by his uncharitable enemies to his hardihood in guilt, bespoke his inward complacency. With an apparent joy he mounted the scaffold, "as if," says Fuller, "rather to gain a crown than to lose a head,"—"and, to say the truth, it was no scaffold, but a throne—a throne whereon he shortly was to receive a crown, even the most glorious crown of martyrdom[1]."

The venerable Primate's enemies, however, seemed resolved to annoy him. They had crowded beneath the scaffold, and when he ascended it, they endeavoured to discompose him by looking upwards through the holes and crevices, with the most inhuman and indecent exultation. Yet his wonted humour and presence of mind did not forsake him. He besought the attendants to fill those crevices with clay; for he did not, he said, wish his inno-

[1] Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 215. Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 142.

cent blood to fall on the heads of those deluded people.

Before he prepared for death he addressed the multitude in what has been termed a sermon speech, or his funeral sermon, preached by himself; and, as he feared neither the frowns of the vulgar enthusiasts who surrounded him, nor in that situation valued the applauses of his friends, he disdained any attempt to excite the sympathy of the beholders. From a written paper he read this address, commencing with the two first verses of the twelfth chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, "Let us run with patience the race which is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God."

The Archbishop commenced by entreating his hearers to pardon his making use of papers, on account of his great age, and the mournful occasion. It was, he said, an uncomfortable place to preach, yet he would begin with that text of holy Scripture. He had been long in his race, he observed, and how he had looked unto Jesus, the author and finisher of his faith, was best known to Him. He had now come to the end of his race, and he found the cross a death of shame; but the shame must be despised, or there was no coming to the right hand of God. He then proceeded to discourse in a remarkably pious and unaffected strain. He prayed to God that the eyes of the people might be opened

to behold their delusions. He acknowledged, in all humility, that he had often erred both in word and deed; but he doubted not of the Divine mercy for him as well as for other sinners. He had searched his heart, and, whatever sins he had committed, he found none deserving of death by the laws of this kingdom. He charged nothing upon his judges; and in this he entreated to be rightly understood; for it was their duty to proceed by proof, and in that way any person might be condemned. Yet, he thanked God, though his sentence lay heavy upon him, he felt no fearful anticipations. He was not the first Archbishop who had died in that way; and some of his predecessors had lost their lives, though not by the same process. Elfegus was hurried away, and was murdered by the Danes; Simon Sudbury fell a victim to the fury of Wat Tyler and his associates. Long before those, St. John the Baptist was the victim of a licentious woman; and St. Cyprian, Archbishop of Carthage, nobly submitted his neck to the sword of his persecutors. These and other examples taught him patience, and he hoped his cause would be otherwise judged by Heaven than it had been on earth. He had heard of the clamours agaainst him, that he wished to introduce Popery, yet he fervently hoped the Pope would not come in by the sectaries. In the mean time, "by honour and dishonour, by good and evil report, as a deceiver, yet true," was he now leaving the world.

The Archbishop then divided his discourse into

four topics. In the first, he vindicated the King from the charge of Popery; in the second, he lamented the delusions of the citizens of London, and the miserable clamours which they had lately raised for justice, by which they would bring the blood of many innocent persons on their own heads; in the third, he lamented the situation of the Church of England, which, after having withstood all the contrivances of Jesuits and other Popish priests, was now rent in twain by faction, and betrayed in the house of its pretended friends. The last particular (for he was not willing to be tedious, since he wished to hasten out of this miserable world,) concerned himself; and he besought all who were within the reach of his voice to observe, that he died in the bosom of the Church of England, in which he was born and baptized, and in the profession of the Protestant religion of that Church, in which he had always lived, and in which he now came to die. He had been accused of high treason by the Parliament; a crime which his soul abhorred: in the presence of Almighty God, and the holy angels, he solemnly protested, that he never endeavoured the subversion of the laws of the realm, or of the Protestant religion; and he desired all to remember this his solemn protest, both on these and all manner of treasons whatsoever. He had been accused as an enemy to Parliaments; which he denied. He understood them too well, and the benefits derived from them: but he objected to their abuses and corruptions, since there was no corrup-

tion in the world so bad as that which is best, for the better the thing is in nature the worse it is when corrupted. He then said he had done: he forgave all the world, and his bitter enemies who had doomed him to this death: he besought forgiveness of God, and then of every man whom he might have offended [1].

Having finished his dying address, the Archbishop then desired the people to join with him in prayer, and, kneeling down, he thus expressed himself:

"O Eternal God and merciful Father, look down upon me in mercy; in the riches and fulness of all thy mercies look down upon me, but not till thou hast nailed my sins to the cross of Christ. Look upon me, but not till thou hast bathed me in the blood of Christ; not till I have hid myself in the wounds of Christ; that so the punishment that is due to my sins may pass away and go over me: and since thou art pleased to try me to the uttermost, I humbly beseech thee, give me now in this great instant full patience, proportionable comfort, a heart ready to die for my sins, the King's happiness, and the preservation of this Church; and my zeal to these (far from arrogance be it spoken,) is all the sin, human frailty excepted, and all incidents thereunto, which is yet known of me in this parti-

[1] Rushworth, Part iii. vol. ii. p. 835—838. Fuller's Church History, book xi. p. 216. Heylin, p. 497—500. Wood. Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 142. Speech, &c. reported by John Hinde, 4to. 1644.

cular, for which I now come to suffer; but otherwise my sins are many and great. Lord, pardon them all, and those especially which have drawn down this present judgment upon me; and when thou hast given me strength to bear it, then do with me as seems best to thee; and carry me through death that I may look upon it in what visage soever it shall appear to me, and that there may be a stop of this issue of blood in this more than miserable kingdom. I pray for the people, too, as well as for myself. O Lord, I beseech thee, give grace of repentance to all people that have a thirst for blood; but if they will not repent, then scatter their devices, and such as are or shall be contrary to the glory of thy great name, the truth and sincerity of religion, the establishment of the King, and his posterity after him in their just rights and privileges, the honour and conservation of Parliament, in their ancient and just power, the preservation of this poor Church in the truth, peace, and patrimony, and the settlement of this distracted and distressed people under their ancient laws and in their native liberties. And when thou hast done all this in mere mercy for them, O Lord, fill their hearts with thankfulness, and with religious dutiful obedience to thee and thy commandments all their days. Amen, Lord Jesus, and I beseech thee receive my soul into thy bosom, Amen. Our Father," &c.

After these devotions, the Archbishop arose, and gave his papers to Dr. Stern, his chaplain, who

accompanied him to the scaffold, saying, "Doctor, I give you this, that you may shew it to your fellow-chaplains, that they may see how I went out of the world, and God's blessing and mercy be upon you and them." Then turning to a person named Hinde, whom he perceived busy writing the words of his address, he said, "Friend, I beseech you, hear me. I cannot say I have spoken every word as it is in my paper, but I have gone very near it, to help my memory as well as I could, but I beseech you, let me have no wrong done me:" intimating that he ought not to publish an imperfect copy. "Sir," replied Hinde, "you shall not. If I do so, let it fall upon my own head. I pray God have mercy upon your soul." "I thank you," answered the venerable sufferer; "I did not speak with any jealousy as if you would do so, but only, as a poor man going out of the world, it is not possible for me to keep to the words of my paper, and a phrase might do me wrong."

The Archbishop now prepared for the block, and observing the scaffold crowded with people, he said, "I thought there would have been an empty scaffold, that I might have had room to die. I beseech you, let me have an end of this misery, for I have endured it long." When the space was cleared, he said, "I will pull off my doublet, and God's will be done. I am willing to go out of the world; no man can be more willing to send me out, than I am willing to be gone."

Yet, in this trying moment, when he was dis-

playing a magnanimity not exceeded by the holy martyrs of the primitive ages, he was beset by a furious enthusiast,—one of those revolutionary demagogues who had brought him to this melancholy end. Sir John Clotworthy, a follower of the Earl of Warwick, and an Irishman by birth, irritated because the revilings of the people made no impression on this renowned prelate, propounded to him certain questions, with the hope of exposing him to his associates. "What special text of Scripture," asked he, "is now comfortable to a man in his departure?" "*Cupio dissolvi, et esse cum Christo,*" was the Archbishop's meek reply. "That is a good desire," said the enthusiast, "but there must be a foundation for that divine assurance." "No man can express it," replied the Archbishop, "it is to be found within." "It is founded upon a word, nevertheless," said Clotworthy, "and that word should be known." "That word," replied the Archbishop, "is the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and that alone." Perceiving, however, that there would be no end to this indecent interruption, the Primate turned to the executioner, and giving him some money, said, "Here, honest friend, God forgive thee, and do thine office upon me in mercy." He was then desired by the executioner to give some sign when he should strike, to which he replied, "I will, but first let me fit myself."

The Archbishop then knelt down before the block, and thus prayed: "Lord, I am coming as fast as I can. I know I must pass through the shadow of

death before I can come to thee; yet it is but *umbra mortis,* a mere shadow of death, a little darkness upon nature, but thou, by thy merits and passion, hast broke through the jaws of death. So, Lord, receive my soul, and have mercy upon me, and bless this kingdom with peace and with plenty, and with brotherly love, and charity, that there may not be this effusion of Christian blood amongst them, for Jesus Christ's sake, if it be thy will."

Having thus prayed, the Archbishop laid his head upon the fatal block, and when he had said, "Lord, receive my soul," which was the signal for the executioner, his head was struck off at one blow.

Such was the melancholy but triumphant death of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, aged seventy-one years, thirteen weeks, and four days. Thus he died, a victim to revolutionary faction and sectarian enthusiasm, a sacrifice to Presbyterian schism and Covenanting rebellion. The multitude, a part of whom came to scoff, and some to pray, had no sooner beheld the murder, than their eyes filled with tears; and many of them who had witnessed this his Christian, magnanimous, and triumphant death, returned with their prejudices alleviated, their passions calmed, their resentments mollified. Stern enthusiasts did indeed glory in the crime; and his fanatical enemies, like the Jews of old, thought they had done God service by this deed of infamy and blood. His friends, however, embalmed his body with their tears, and proceeded to perform the last offices of Christian duty with

reverence to his memory and his exalted virtues. Thus he died, "if, indeed, he may be said to die, the great example of whose virtue shall continue always, not only in the minds of men, but in the annals of succeeding ages, with renown and fame." Thus died this most reverend prelate, "the King's and the Church's martyr; a man of such integrity, learning, devotion, and courage, as, had he lived in the primitive times, would have given him another name; whom, though the cheated multitude were taught to misconceive, (for those honoured him most who best knew him,) yet impartial posterity will know how to value him, when they hear that the rebels sentenced him on the same day they voted down the Liturgy of the Church of England [1]."

Laud fell, and with him those works of splendour and magnificence which his lofty genius had designed; works which, had he lived, would have been the boast of England, the admiration of foreign nations. Avarice was no part of his disposition; the monuments of his munificence yet remain; his enlarged soul disdained sordid aggrandizement; his country was to him the object of his unwearied solicitude, the Church of England the heir to all his fortunes. Laud fell, and with him the Church,—that Church, the piety and learning of whose clergy have hitherto been unparalleled, and never will be exceeded,—that Church, the bulwark of the Protestant Refor-

[1] Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. iii. col. 143, 144.

mation, established in the blood of its venerable Reformers, overthrown by the death of him, its illustrious and venerable son. Then was the triumph of sectarianism complete; religion and learning wept over the melancholy ruins; hosts of fanatical sectaries, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Gospellers, Famillists, Seekers, and others, a vulgar herd, overran the kingdom; mechanics, soldiers, boys, and women, supplanted those scholars of renown, whose works are imperishable, whose names are immortal in the annals of our country. All was a scene of horrible confusion, of revolutionary strife, and lawless ambition. Yet happy was Laud in this his triumphant fall; he saw not that overwhelming inundation of fanaticism and rebellion which swept away the noble constitution of the English monarchy;—the ruin of the clergy; the murder of his beloved and gracious sovereign; the exile of the Royal House; the triumph of regicides; and the despotism of an hypocritical usurper.

"Tu felix, ILLUSTRISSIME ANTISTES, non vitæ tantum claritate, sed etiam opportunitate mortis; ut perhibent qui interfuerunt novissimis sermonibus tuis, constans et libens fatum excepisti, tanquam pro virili portione innocentiam populo donares. Sed NOBIS, præter acerbitatem parentis erepti, auget mœstitiam, quod assidere valetudini, fovere deficientem, satiari vultu, complexu, non contigit. Excepissemus certe mandata vocesque, quas penitus animo fingeremus; noster hic dolor, nostrum vulnus;

—Si quis piorum manibus locus; si, ut sapientibus placet, non cum corpore extinguuntur magnæ animæ, placide quiescas, nosque, domum tuam, ab infirmo desiderio, et muliebribus lamentis, ad contemplationem virtutum tuarum voces, quas neque lugeri, neque plangi, fas est; admiratione te potius, temporalibus laudibus, et, si natura suppeditet, militum decoremus. Is verus honos, ea conjunctissimi cujusque pietas. Quicquid, ILLUSTRISSIME ANTISTES, ex te amavimus; quicquid, mirati sumus, manet; mansurumque est in animis hominum, in æternitate temporum, fama rerum. Nam multos veterum velut inglorios et ignobiles oblivio obruet: LAUDUS, posteritati narratus et traditus, superstes erit[1]."

[1] Tacit. in Vita Agricolæ, Opera Omnia, fol. Antwerp. 1585, p. 238.

CHAPTER XXIV.

1644-5.

Fall of the Church—Character of Archbishop Laud—His patronage of great men—Remarks on his religious principles—His burial—His last Will—Conclusion of the History.

The history of this great and illustrious prelate is now brought to a conclusion. We have traced him from his earliest years, throughout all the vicissitudes of his life: so much has been said, that an attempt in this place to delineate his character is almost superfluous.

In charging the murder of the Archbishop on the Scottish Covenanters, it appears, from every circumstance, that the fact is undeniable. Not indeed that the sectaries of England, and, in particular, the English Presbyterian faction, were not as virulent as the other enthusiasts against him; but, either from a respect for his Episcopal character, or a consciousness of the innocence of his life, it is evident that their violence would have been restrained, had they not been influenced by their "dear brethren" the Scots. When we consider the character and practices of the latter enthusiasts, we shall be at no loss to account for their guilty proceedings. "The Presbyterians, by whom," says the noble historian, "I mean the Scots, formed all their counsels by the

inclinations and affections of the people, and first considered how they might corrrupt, and seduce, and dispose them to second their purposes, and how far they might depend upon their concurrence and assistance, before they resolved to make any attempt; and this made them in such a degree submit to their *senseless and wretched clergy*, whose infectious breath corrupted and governed the people, and whose authority was prevalent upon their wives, and in their domestic affairs: and yet they never communicated to them more than the outside of their designs[1]." By demagogues of this description, (and it is not over-coloured,) no limits were assigned to their dark and daring practices; their passions were violent, and their hatred was fierce.

Yet, generally speaking, the murder of the Archbishop is chargeable on all the revolutionists of that age, although the Scots were the primary cause, as is confessed by the republican Ludlow. And if the Archbishop was innocent, the guilt of the Puritans was of the deepest dye. Whatever may be thought, in the abstract, at the present time of the Archbishop's conduct, whether it be condemned as foolish, tyrannical, or unjust, it must not be forgotten, that the acts on which his enemies founded their false and distorted accusations were not his alone, but the joint acts of the Privy Council, Star

[1] Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, Oxford edit. vol. iii. p. 153.

Chamber, and High Commission, in which he was only an individual; that they were sanctioned by the greatest men of the age, and that they were authorized by the laws of the times. The injustice of his enemies in charging him alone with the whole odium of their pretended grievances, he felt most acutely during his imprisonment. "I have," said he, "a long time found, by sad experience, that whatsoever some men disliked, was presently my doing:" and again, "I humbly conceive that I ought not, by law, nor by usage of parliamentary proceedings, be charged singly for those things which are done in public courts [1]." It has indeed become fashionable with certain men, to identify patriotism with Puritanism, to represent Laud as a furious bigot, and his royal master as an arbitrary tyrant. To such men the House of Stuart is the foundation of all their political resentments; their judgments have become perverted by this furious indulgence of their factious passions. Loyalty in those days is with them a crime; they affect to ridicule legitimacy, and the defenders of hereditary right. Yet in this ridiculous assumption of liberality, there is a hollowness which denotes its superficial character; and, being too *enlightened* to be influenced by religion, which they utterly contemn, while they profess to be actuated by a mild philosophy, they are fostering vain delusions among the ignorant, and strengthening that malevolent

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 107. 245, 252, 253. 415. 437.

spirit which sets at nought the ordinances and institutions of God and man.

It is observed by Lord Clarendon, who knew him intimately, that the Archbishop's "learning, piety, and virtue, have been attained by very few, and the greatest of his infirmities are common to all, even to the best of men." It is needless to quote the sentiments of other writers. He was pious without ostentation; his theology was uninfected by the sectarian prejudices of the times, and he well knew the dangerous tendency of those opinions which then prevailed, alike destructive to civil and ecclesiastical order. In the practice of his devotions he was equally conscientious. His Diary has been condemned as weak and superstitious, but I greatly fear that those who thus *ex cathedra* pronounce this opinion, are themselves the weakest and the most superstitious. Consisting, as it does, of brief annotations on the most remarkable passages of his life; mere references, by initials, to persons and transactions, which no one could understand but himself[1], and never intended to meet the public eye, it is unjust to draw such inferences as those set forth by his modern enemies. It is remarked by Fuller, who also knew the Archbishop well, that "he can hardly be an ill husband who casteth up his receipts and expences every night; and such a soul is, or would be, good, which enters into a daily

[1] For example, he says, "Hope was given to me of A. H." &c. (Diary, p. 2.) Such annotations frequently occur.

scrutiny of its own actions." Indeed, his friends condemned him for keeping such a register in those dangerous days; yet it goes far to prove the piety, innocence, and religion in private, which he so often manifested in public, through "good and evil report[1]."

Nor was the Archbishop less exemplary in the practice of moral duties. His strict integrity raised against him many enemies: his life was regular, chaste, sober, temperate, and humble in his private carriage. In his Diary, he asserts that he was unfortunate with E. B., on which his inveterate enemy, Prynne, remarks, that "perchance he was unclean with E. B." Such was the charitable construction of his accusers. But whatever was the error which he committed, he observed the day thereof ever afterwards as an anniversary humiliation. "An exact Diary," says Fuller, "is a window into his heart who maketh it, and therefore pity it is that any should look therein but either the friends of the party, or such ingenuous foes as will not (especially in things doubtful) make conjectural comments to his disgrace. But, be E. B. male or female, and the sin committed of what kind soever, his fault whispers not so much to his shame, as his solemn humiliation sounds to his commendation[2]."

In the same manner he disliked covetousness and avarice, which is undeniable from his many acts of munificence. Nor was he partial to his own rela-

[1] Fuller, book xi. p. 218. [2] Ibid. ut sup. p. 216.

tions, unless he saw in them some indications of genius and talent. Fuller informs us that he knew one of his kinsmen in the University, a good scholar, but idle and lazy, whom on no consideration he would prefer till he saw signs of amendment. Gaudy ostentation was what he also disliked, and he administered severe reproofs to those clergymen who appeared in rich and gaudy apparel. He has the merit of first discouraging this display. The Church historian has recorded an anecdote which is remarkably characteristic. When Bishop of London, at a Visitation in Essex, a clergyman of good family and estate appeared in a "very gallant habit," whom Laud publicly reproved, telling him to observe the plainness of his own dress. "My Lord," said the clergyman, "you have better clothes at home, and I have worse." This answer pleased the Bishop, who always admired a good humoured reply.

In stature the Archbishop was low, of slender appearance, though strongly formed; of a cheerful countenance, penetrating eye, clear judgment, and tenacious memory. His natural disposition was full of vivacity, zealous in whatever he undertook, though sometimes hasty and imprudent in his expressions. It is said that he was indiscreet and sometimes obstinate, pursuing with the same zeal things important and indifferent, and often pronouncing judgment on causes which he imperfectly understood. These, however, are errors incidental to

humanity; no man is perfect: they are "common to all, even to the best of men."

The distinguishing feature of the Archbishop's public character was his opposition to the Puritans. He hated them heartily, and he was no less heartily hated by them. His great business was to check their extravagant, absurd, and dangerous notions, which in that age could not be accomplished without some acts of severity. If, however, he carried himself too far against them, they amply retaliated by bringing him to the block. His grand object was uniformity—a measure unquestionably impracticable. But he did no more than the Puritans and Presbyterians; if he wished all men to conform to the Church, the Presbyterians insisted in the same way with their Covenant; and went farther, by declaring that salvation was impossible unless it was established; they swore to enforce it by the sword; their object was "an uniformity of doctrine and discipline in the three kingdoms." By this hope the Scots were allured into England, this induced them to excite commotions in Ireland; and so fearful was the tyranny of Presbyterianism during its ephemeral triumph in England, that it exceeded in arrogance and terror the fiery intolerance of the Roman Catholic Church.

The conduct, however, of this illustrious Primate appears still more striking when we consider the many great men who owed their advancement to his patronage, although he differed from them in

some of their principles. By his influence Usher was advanced to the primacy of the Irish Church, though a Calvinist; the learned Morton was also advanced to the See of Durham; and Montague, whose admirable learning is confessed even by his virulent enemies, owed his promotion to this great man [1]. The distinguished orientalist, Dr. Edward Pococke, to whom he gave the Arabic lectureship, which he founded at Oxford, was indebted to his munificence and liberality; with the venerable Hall, Bishop of Norwich, whom he persuaded to write the admirable treatise, "Episcopacy by Divine Right," he was on terms of great familiarity, and promoted his removal from Exeter to Norwich. The celebrated Dr. Robert Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln, one of the most learned casuists of his age, was, on Laud's recommendation, appointed chaplain in ordinary to the King, thus happily for his country drawn out from that privacy in which he had unostentatiously lived [2]. Selden, justly termed "the glory of England," also experienced the Archbishop's friendship, though he did not agree with him in temper or in principles; it was by Laud's persuasion that he wrote the famous treatise, "Mare Clausum," against the well known treatise of Hugo Grotius, "Mare Liberum," in which he vindicated the sovereignty of the English monarchs over the British Seas, in opposition to the arrogant pretensions of the Dutch. The celebrated Edward

[1] Selden, De Diis Syris, p. 362.

[2] Walton, p. 15.

Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, found in Laud his first patron; and to the honour of the Primate it must be recorded, that the free remonstrances and reproofs which he received from that distinguished nobleman made him conceive for him a stronger attachment. Archbishop Sheldon, one of his illustrious successors in the metropolitan see, was first promoted by Laud, who gave him the rectory of Newington in Oxfordshire, 1633. Somner, an eminent antiquarian, and author of the Saxon Dictionary, received an eminent promotion in the ecclesiastical courts from the Primate, whose virtues and learning he has gratefully expressed in the Dedication to his "Antiquities of Canterbury," published in quarto, 1640. Sir Henry Spelman was also recommended to the King by the Archbishop, and it was by his joint recommendation that he wrote the learned work, "The History of the English Councils." He brought the services of the excellent Bishop Juxon to benefit his country, although that measure was the origin of implacable hatred and malice toward him. His connexion and influence with John Hales, "the ever-memorable," and the famous Chillingworth, have already been mentioned.

These are only a very few of the illustrious men, the glory and the renown of their age, the boast of England, whom this illustrious prelate either brought into notice, or patronized by his munificence and friendship. The matter of Uniformity, which brought on him the odious imputation of Popery, deserves now a special consideration. It is to be observed,

that the charges alleged at his trial were exhibited in the highest colour of aggravation. He was condemned as a Papist, because he repaired the windows of his chapel with stained glass; possessed a Bible with Popish pictures, and had similar pictures in his gallery at Lambeth Palace; used copes in churches; insisted on reverence in devotion, and on that strict ecclesiastical discipline without which there can be no right ministration of the offices of religion. Prynne, Burton, Bastwick, and a host of other enthusiasts, appeared in the lists, whose conduct has already been detailed, the former publishing an edition of his Diary, *without his consent*, with infamous notes, falsehoods, and mutilated statements. Others followed the example of this despicable incendiary, and among these various foreign writers. Thus, Lewis Du Moulin, (whom Wood most appropriately terms *another villain,)* contributed his share to circulate the odious allegation in France. In his "Patronus Bonæ Fidei in Causa Puritanorum contra Hierarchos Anglos," (8vo. 1672,) after the "Præfatio ad Reverendos Pastores Ecclesiarum Reformatarum in Gallia," in which he indulges in an ignorant tirade against the Church of England, he proceeds, in the "Specimen Confutationis Vindiciarum Durellianarum," to give a brief account of the Archbishop's life, evidently taken from Prynne's infamous Breviat. "Vix Laudo serpserat prima lanugo per genas," says he in the outset [1], "cum

[1] Specimen, &c. p. 62.

mitro hujus seculi, pene solus se opposuit torrenti Puritanorum, qui ubique numero et gratia valebant in Anglia, in aula, in regni consiliis, imprimis in sacro Reginæ consistorio atque Academiis, omnibus in locis, uniformitate vix caput exerente, aut lacertos movente," &c. Then proceeding to recapitulate the events of Laud's life, as published in the Breviat, he thus proceeds: " Porro nunquam illustrius se prodidit, hinc malus, abjectus, degener et inglorius animus et mala mens Laudi, odiumque in pietatem et pietatis vindices et cultores Puritanos, illinc vero optima mens, constans et generosa indoles, tum acris impetus, non solum ad pia, sed ad grandia, fortia et generosa facta, quibus testandis nulla par oratio datur, nullæ imagines, nulla monumenta satis digna erigi et prædicari possunt."—" Nam altare erat idolum Laudi, circa cujus cultum et vindicias rationesque quibus illum æstruebat, insaniebat plusquam infans, ut docent argumenta futilia, quibus hunc cultum firmat, et quæ profert oratione habita in Camera Stellata contra triumviratum tantopere celebrem Burtonum, Prynne, et Bastwick." These (for it is needless to quote at large) are *specimens* of the details of Lewis Du Moulin.

It requires no argument to shew the utter ignorance of this writer on English history, and of the faction which he so extravagantly extols. But there are other parts which prove at once the *futilia argumenta* he employs in his assertions, that the Archbishop was inclined to Popery, which must not be omitted. Thomas Gage, an Irishman, and a

monk of the Spanish Jacobins, was sent on a mission to the Philippine Islands in 1625. Having remained there for some time, he acquired property, returned to England, and joined the Puritan enthusiasts[1]. He published, among other things, a "History of the West Indies," which appeared in folio, published in London, 1648, and a French edition of it at Paris, in two volumes octavo, 1677. In the octavo edition the twenty-second chapter was suppressed, which is inserted in the edition of 1648. This chapter was published in a pamphlet, which is now exceedingly rare, 1712, entitled, "Some Remarkable passages relating to Archbishop Laud, particularly of his Affection to the Church of Rome;" and it contains the following story.

Gage, on his return to England, resorted to some of the churches in London, "to see the service performed, and to hear the word of God preached," but so, as he pretends, "that he might not be seen, known, or discovered by any Papist;" and when he heard the organs and music, the prayers and collects, he could perceive little difference between the two Churches. Then he became acquainted with one Price, superior of the Benedictine Monks, who, he affirms, was a familiar friend of the Archbishop, and that priest told him, that he hoped soon to be made Parish Priest and Curate of Covent Garden, nay, ultimately a Bishop in England; and that he trusted he would yet raise

[1] See his "Recantation Sermon," 4to. 1642.

Gage to the same rank[1]. After a variety of adventures, Gage says he proceeded to Rome, and delivered letters to certain cardinals, one of whom was Francisco Barberini, who appeared to know much of the state of England, and who asked him several questions concerning the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, he feared, would excite some great disturbance in the kingdom. The said Cardinal declared, that, for the Archbishop's sake, the King had dissolved the last Parliament; he inquired what were the dispositions of the English nation towards the Archbishop, and whether they suspected he had any communication with Rome, and observed, that the creation of one English Cardinal would be of great advantage for the conversion of the whole kingdom. "I laid up in my heart," says Gage, "all this discourse, and well perceived some great matters were in agitation at Rome, and some secret compliance from England with that Court, which I purposed to discover more at large among some friends there."

Then follows the "discovery." This same Gage was soon afterwards invited to dinner at the English College, by the Rector, Father Fitzherbert, and, after some conversation, the discourse turned on England, and Archbishop Laud. After praising Laud, as he pretends, for his moderation to Papists, and vilifying Abbot, his predecessor; "the now Archbishop," said the Jesuit, "is not only favourable

[1] New Survey, &c. folio, 2d edit. London, 1655. p. 205.

to us there, but here desireth to make daily demonstrations of his great affection to this our court and Church, which he shewed not long since in sending a Common Prayer-Book, *which he had composed for the Church of Scotland,* to be *first viewed and approved of by our Pope and Cardinals,* who perceiving it, liked it very well, for Protestants to be trained in a form of prayer and service." The worthy Jesuit, however, had his doubts on the expediency of the measure, considering the state of Scotland and the tenets of the people; the Cardinals, therefore, sent it back to the Archbishop, with thanks for his "dutiful compliance" with their wishes, but advised him not to send it to Scotland, because they understood "the Scots disliked all set forms of prayer, and would not be limited to the invention of man, having, as they conceived, the true and unerring Spirit of God in them;" all which the said Father Fitzherbert declared was truth, he being witness thereof, being "sent for by the Cardinals," to give them his opinion on the measure. "And this most true relation," says Gage, "of William Laud, late Archbishop of Canterbury, (though I have often spoken of it in private discourse, and publicly preached it at the lecture in Kent,) I could not in my conscience omit here, both to vindicate the just censure of death which the now sitting Parliament have passed upon him, for such like practices and compliances with Rome, and to reprove the ungrounded opinion and error of those ignorant and malignant spirits,

who, to my knowledge, have, since his death, exalted him, and cried him up for a martyr."

On this story Du Moulin takes his ground for assuming that Archbishop Laud was secretly a Papist. "Sed nemo Thoma Gageo viro integerrimo parentibus Anglis et Pontificiis, qui 20 anno fuit Franciscanus in America, in sua Historia Indiæ Occidentalis, locupletior est testis consiliorum Laudi eò spectantium ut Angliam reconciliaret Romæ, quemadmodum comperiit cum Romæ esset ex colloquiis cum Cardinali Francisco Barbarino et Fitzherbert Jesuita." And again: "Sed nec fuit hæc vox duntaxat Pontificiorum. Baro Fackland et Dr. Warmstrey inter Protestantes Anglos eadem testantur de Laudo et tota Laudensium cohorte[1]."

Now, here it may be observed, that to adduce the idle talk at Rome about the creation of an English Cardinal as proof, is utterly absurd: and the whole story is proved to be false from the fact, that the Scottish Service Book was not compiled by Laud, but by the Scottish Bishops. On this simple fact the whole story rests, and this being kept in remembrance, will prove the falsehood of the story. I have already shewn, that so far from wishing to compile a new Liturgy for Scotland, Laud was opposed to any other than the English, —that he had no share in its compilation; and I again maintain, that this said Liturgy (now disused) is as far removed from Popery as is the Scottish

[1] Specimen, &c. p. 11. 13.

Presbyterian Confession of Faith. Let it be observed, too, that this rumour had reached the ears of the Marquis of Hamilton when he was first sent as commissioner,—that he wrote to Con, the noted Popish emissary then in London, to ascertain its truth, (and Gage often refers to this Jesuit, telling us that his house in Long Acre was the chief resort of the Papists,) and that Con offered solemnly to declare *upon oath*, in a letter to the Marquis, that it was utterly false,—that he was at Rome at the time of the introduction of the Scottish Liturgy, and heard not a syllable of the affair,—that the Pope had never been consulted,—and that no such thing as a Liturgy was ever mentioned there. This is unquestionably a complete refutation of Gage's story, even were there no other evidence, as it is not to be supposed that Con, *who was himself a Scotsman*, and connected with one of the best families in that country, could be ignorant of, or would deny, had it been true, an affair which was productive of such momentous results to the kingdom.

To the same purpose, also, other writers have added their testimony, either misled by, or infected with, the enthusiasm of the Puritans and Covenanters. Sir Edward Peyton declares, that the imposition of the Book of Common Prayer on the Scots was "a stratagem by the artifice of Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, to bring into the country the Episcopal Government, to unite both kingdoms in one form of Church, in something agreeable

with Rome, as a bridge over which he might bring both people to Popery, to ingratiate himself with the Pope for a Cardinal's hat[1]." Now, in refutation of this, it is to be observed, that Scotland was essentially Episcopal for fifty years before the riot about the Liturgy, and that Laud had the offer of a Cardinal's hat four years before the Liturgy was compiled. It is not likely, therefore, that this could be his motive, since he could have obtained that elevation, had he been so disposed, without sustaining any part in the Scottish troubles. It is declared by Monsieur De Wicquefort[2], that "he who wrote the history of those times on the best authority says, that the Archbishop of Canterbury himself was much inclined thereto (to Popery,) and resolved to follow Rosetté, (the Popish agent here,) to Rome, if Cardinal Barberini would have insured him of a *pension of* 48,000 *livres*[3]." A miserable recompence, doubtless, for such a sacrifice; but who the person was who wrote the history of those times on the *best authority,* Wicquefort does not inform us—a testimony, therefore, of no consideration.

[1] Divine Catastrophe of the House of Stuart, 12mo. London, 1652, p. 9.

[2] L'Ambassadeur et ses Fonctions, 4to. Hague edit. 1671. p. 37.

[3] "Celuy qui a escrit l'histoire des temps, sur de fort bons memoires, dit que l'Archevesque de Canterberry mesme y estoit fort disposé, et resolu de suivre Rosetté à Rome, si le Cardinal Barberin eust voulu l'asseurer d'une pension de quarent huit mille livres."

It is somewhat singular that "among those ignorant and malignant spirits who extolled the Archbishop as a martyr," not a single Papist is to be found; and surely they would by no means be silent on a subject which so evidently concerns themselves. Let us, however, turn our attention to other writers, who were no great admirers of the Archbishop or his principles. "He so little thought," says one, "of restoring the Roman Catholic Church [in England,] that, on the contrary, he hoped, by that external appearance he gave to every thing, to allure the [Roman] Catholics of the kingdom into the Communion of the Church of England, and to dissolve that unity which kept them attached to the Chair of St. Peter[1]." The historian Rapin thus expresses himself. "The Presbyterians had got into their heads that a project was formed to re-establish the Roman religion in England.—They imagined that the King's ministers, the Council, Bishops, and particularly the new Archbishop of Canterbury, were the authors of this project.—For my part, I verily believe that neither the King, nor the Archbishop, nor the ministers, for the most

[1] Salmonet, Histoire des Troubles de la Grande Bretagne, 1661, p. 26. "Il pensoit si peu a y restablir la Communion Catholique, qu'au contraire il esperoit par cette face exterieure qu'il donnoit a toutes choses, et qui resembloit fort a celle des premiers temps de l'Eglise, d'attirer les Catholiques de ce Royaume-là à la Communion Anglicane, et de rompre ce lieu d'unité qui les tient attachez à la chaire unique de St. Pierre."

part, ever formed such a design. At least, in all that has been said on this subject, I have not met with any proof which to me seemed, I will not say strong enough to convince, but even to have the least probability. Nevertheless, it is certain that this opinion prevailed more and more among the people, and the Presbyterians used their endeavours to gain it credit. I do not know whether they believed it themselves, or whether they only thought it would be for their advantage to throw this reproach upon the Church of England, that they might strengthen their party, in which they succeeded beyond expectation[1]." Wilson, in the History of his own Life, details a conversation he had at Bruges, 1637, with a Dr. Weston, to the following effect. "The little Archbishop of Canterbury," says Wilson, "he (Weston) could not endure. I pulled a book out of my pocket, written by the Provincial of the English Friars, Joannes de Sancta Clara, which tended to reconcile the Church of England and the Church of Rome, if we would come up a step to them, and they come down a step to us. 'I know the man,' observed Weston, 'he is one of Canterbury's trencher-flies, and eats perpetually at his table—a creature of his making.'—'Then,' said I, 'you should better approve my Lord of Canterbury's actions, seeing he tends so much to your way.'—'No,' replied he, 'he is too subtle to be

[1] Rapin's History, 8vo. edit. vol. x. p. 273.

yoked; too ambitious to have a superior. He will never submit to Rome. He means to frame a motley religion of his own, and to be lord of it himself[1].'"

Other testimonies might be produced to the same effect. I might quote the admirable expostulatory letter which the Archbishop wrote to Sir Kenelm Digby on his recantation to the Church of Rome, which redounds so much to his honour[2]: I might quote from his own works, and from his repeated declarations. Yet there are two testimonies that must not be omitted. The one is that of the celebrated and learned John Evelyn, who was at Rome when the news of the Archbishop's murder, and a copy of his sermon on the scaffold, arrived in that city. The priests, he declared, read the sermon with great contempt, and looked upon him as one of their greatest enemies[3]. This he gave under his own hand, believing himself called upon, in justice to the Primate's memory, to give this illustration. Sir Henry Mildmay told the Archbishop himself, that he was the most odious man at Rome who had sat in the See of Canterbury since the Reformation; and his brother, Antony Mildmay, declared that to the Jesuits he was particularly obnoxious[4]. Finally, Whiston, vicar of

[1] Peck's Desiderata Curiosa, vol. ii. book xii. p. 22.

[2] Dated Lambeth, 27th of March, 1636. Troubles and Trials, p. 613—616.

[3] Troubles and Trials, p. 616.

[4] State Trials, vol. i. p. 897.

Bethenden, in Kent, attested, under his own hand, on the 28th of September, 1694, that when he was chaplain to Sir Lionel Tollemache, in 1666, he heard him relate, that in his younger days when he was at Rome, in 1644-5, he was acquainted with a certain Abbot, who asked him on one occasion, whether he had heard any news from England? On being answered in the negative, "Then," said the Abbot, "I will tell you some; Archbishop Laud is beheaded."—"You are sorry for that, I presume," said Sir Lionel; but the Abbot replied, "that they had more cause to rejoice, that the greatest enemy of the Church of Rome in England was now cut off, and the greatest champion of the Church of England silenced."

The munificent actions of this illustrious prelate have already been detailed, and it would be superfluous to repeat them here. What he did for the University of Oxford alone, will remain a lasting monument of his genius and pious care. His works, though detached, are numerous; some of them were published during his life, others at a much more recent period. Those which he superintended himself are, 1. Seven Sermons, preached on public occasions, in 1621, 1622, 1625, 1626, and 1628, published in 4to. in their respective years, and reprinted in one volume at London, in 1651. 2. His celebrated Conference with Fisher the Jesuit, published in folio, London, 1624, under the name of R. B.—Richard Baylie, who married his niece, at

that time his chaplain, and afterwards President of St. John's College[1]. 3. "An Answer to the Remonstrance of the House of Commons in 1628." This is a reply to the charges which the Commons brought against him and Bishop Neale of being Popishly inclined, and the patrons of "Arminian errors." 4. "A Speech delivered in the Star Chamber, on Wednesday, the 14th of June, 1637, at the censure of John Bastwick, Henry Burton, and William Prynne, concerning pretended innovations in the Church." London, 4to. 1637. The following were published after his death. "Annotations, or Memorables of King James I." published by Prynne, in 1644: it is to be found in the first volume of Rushworth's Collections, only two pages, folio. 2. "The Diary of his Life," which was first pub-

[1] This Conference was afterwards printed in 1637 and 1673, with his own name. It was answered by a Jesuit named Thomas Carwell, or Thorold, a native of Lincolnshire, in a folio volume, entitled "Labyrinthus Cantuariensis, or Dr. Laud's Labyrenth, being an Answer to the late Archbishop of Canterbury's late Conference between himself and Mr. Fisher," &c. Par. alias London, 1658, which was answered by Dr. Meric Casaubon, and Edward Stillingfleet. Fisher himself appears to have written a reply, under the signature of A. C. which Laud answered, in a reply to the "Exceptions of A. C.," which is now printed with the Conference. This performance, however, was answered in 1640, by a Presbyterian fanatic, in a volume entitled, "A Replie to a Relation of the Conference betweene William Laude and Mr. Fisher the Jesuite, by a Witnesse of Jesus Christ. Imprinted anno 1640," 4to. It consists of four hundred and five small pages, besides a most presumptuous dedication to the King.

lished by Prynne, in September, 1644, and entitled, "A Breviat," shamefully mutilated by that enthusiast, after he had seized his papers. For the publication of this work, which appeared in its authentic state in a folio volume, 1695, the world is indebted to the learned Henry Wharton. It appears that all the Archbishop's papers, and the Diary among the rest, remained in Prynne's possession till his death, which took place after the Restoration. Archbishop Sheldon, knowing that these papers had been seized, and unjustly detained by that incendiary, procured a warrant from the King and Privy Council to search his house. Sir William Dugdale and others were deputed to this business, and delivered to Archbishop Sheldon all the papers and documents which they found, though diminished in number, and much injured since they had been seized by Prynne's ravenous hands. Whether the original copy of the Diary was then found, or procured by the Archbishop in some other manner, is uncertain; but, when he obtained possession of the papers, he consigned them to the care of Dr. Sancroft, then Dean of St. Paul's, requiring him to arrange and publish them. Dr. Sancroft undertook the task, but, on perusing the history, found it so much mutilated that he could not publish it till the original was found. After a laborious search it was at last found in the Library of St. John's College, Oxford. While Archbishop Sheldon was meditating its publication, he was overtaken by a sickness which proved mortal; but before his death he commanded Whar-

ton to publish the History. In this volume, besides the Diary, there are the History of the Archbishop's Troubles and Trials, written by himself during his imprisonment in the Tower, containing 443 folio pages,—the Speech delivered by the Archbishop on the Scaffold, which was published also by Hind, in 1645, the original MS. of which is preserved in the Library of St. John's College[1]: the Archbishop's Last Will and Testament; an Answer to the Speech of Lord Say and Seale, touching the Liturgy, which he finished in the Tower; the Annual Accounts of

[1] This Speech provoked a number of fanatics to reply to, and review it. Burton, the Archbishop's implacable enemy, took the lead, and wrote a wretched pamphlet, entitled, "The Grand Impostor Unmasked, or a detection of the notorious hypocrisy and desperate impiety of the late (so styled) Archbishop of Canterbury," &c. London, 4to. 1644, p. 20. "When the fox preacheth, let the geese beware." There also appeared, "The Life and Death of William Laud, late Archbishop of Canterbury, by E. W. who was acquainted with his proceedings at Oxford," &c. 4to. London, 1644, p. 42. "Four Queries touching the late Archbishop," London, 4to. 1644, p. 16. "A Charme for Canterburian Spirits," 4to. London, 1644, p. 8, which has this motto,

"Laud played the devil on the earth so well,
That he is since installed viceroy of hell."

"A full and satisfactory Answer to the Archbishop of Canterbury's Speech or Funeral Sermon, wherein is a full and plenary Discourse to satisfy all those who have been startled with his subtle and Jesuitical fancies in the said Speech," 1645, 4to. "The last Advice of William Laud, late Archbishop, to his Episcopal Brethren, and especially to Bishop Wren, who still remains prisoner in the Tower," &c. 4to. London, 1644, p. 8.

his Province, from 1633 to 1639, with the King's marginal annotations. Notes on Rome's Master Piece, which is there reprinted, or the Plot revealed by Andreas ab Habernfield[1]. Several Letters, one to Dr. Baylie, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, dated August 29, 1637; and another to Dr. Frewen, Vice-Chancellor, February 7, against the Jesuits, and his admirable Letter to Sir Kenelm Digby. 3. His Select Remains, being the second volume of the above, published in folio, 1700, and contains an historical account of all transactions relating to the University of Oxford, from the year 1630, when the Archbishop was elected Chancellor, to 1641, when he resigned the office[2]. 4. *Officium Quotidianum*, or a Manual of Private Devotions, published in 8vo. 1650 and 1663—a truly admirable and pious work, and worthy of its illustrious author. 5. A Summary of Private Devotions, published at London, 1667, from the original MS. preserved in the Library of St. John's, Oxford.

Many of the private papers of the Archbishop are preserved in the Library of his own college, and in the Bodleian Library, Oxford; some of them are in the Library of Lambeth Palace, and some in the British Museum. Many of his letters have been published

[1] This was published in August, 1643, by Prynne, after he had seized the Archbishop's papers. It was sent to the Primate in the Tower, where he wrote the notes.

[2] Published by the Rev. Edmund Wharton, (father of Henry Wharton) Rector of Saxlingham, in Norfolk. It contains much valuable information relative to the University of Oxford.

at various times, chiefly letters of state, in the Cabalas and other works. Fourteen to his friend the Earl of Strafford, are printed in the "Letters and Dispatches" of that nobleman, edited by Dr. William Knowler, (folio, 1739,) several in Dr. Richard Parr's collection of letters to and from Archbishop Usher, and in Ellis's Collection of Original Letters, illustrative of English History; besides others in various books of historical collections and illustrations. There are also eighteen letters of the Archbishop inserted in a folio volume, published in 1690, and collected by Colomesius, entitled, "G. J. Vossii et Clarorum Virorum ad eum Epistolæ [1]." There are many of his letters preserved in the archives of the University of Oxford, particularly in the "Re-

[1] On these Letters the celebrated Limborch has remarked: "Sed imprimis admirabilem se ostendit reverendissimus Archiepiscopus Cantuar. Gulielmus Laudus, ob causam religionis a fervidis zelotis securi percussus: qui adeo graviter impetitus, tot calumniis oneratus, in familiarissimis ad Vossium Epistolis, nullum contra ferocissimos inimicos maledictum profert, sed ad Servatoris sui exemplum, cum malediceretur, non maledixit, et cum peteretur, non comminatus est, sed maledicentibus benedixit, et pro sequentibus se ardentissime precatus est. Hic ab immani criminatione, qua ab infensissimis inimicis coram toto orbe palam et odiose est traductus, quasi Papatum in Ecclesiam Anglicanam reducere moliretur, adeo plene purgatur, ut ne ipsa quidem διαβολη quicquam quod admordeat reperire possit. Extant hic continuatæ ipsius flagitationes, vel decies in epistolis ejus repetitæ, ut Vossius provinciam Baronium confutandi in se suscipiat adeo quidem ut id urgere nunquam destiteret."—In Præfat. ad Præstant. ac Erudit. Viror. Epist. Eccles. &c. 2d edit.

gister," respecting the foundation of his Arabic Lecture, and in the "Res Gestæ Cancellarii Arch. Laud [1]."

These enumerations prove that the Archbishop's fame for learning is well deserved. His munificent gifts are recorded in the annals of the University. No fewer than 1300 volumes of MSS. in various languages did he present to that distinguished seat of learning, and in the Library they are enumerated with an appropriate inscription, "Ex Dono Reverendissimi in Christo Patris D. Gul. Laud, Cantuar. Archiep. Academ. Oxon. Honoratissimi Cancellarii." He also procured the MSS. of Sir Kenelm Digby, for the University [2]. His patronage of Oriental literature has never been surpassed; in this he was munificently liberal. Before the foundation of his lectureship, Oriental literature had not indeed been neglected at Oxford. In the beginning of the 17th century, Matthias Pasor, son of George Pasor, a professor at Herborn, Germany, and author of a valuable Greek Lexicon, came to Oxford. He had been educated both at Herborn and at Heidelburg, in which latter place he became professor of mathematics. At Oxford he was incorporated M.A., and twice a week he read an Arabic lecture, during term, in the Divinity

[1] Letters to the Heads of Colleges on the Arabic Lecture, Regist. R. fol. 109, b. 128, a, 130, b. Cancel. Laud, vol. ii. Tanner's Copy in the Bodleian Library.

[2] Rer Gest. p. 114.

School, for which he was remunerated by his auditors, by whom he was greatly esteemed. He published, " Oratio pro Linguæ Arabicæ Professione, publice ad Academicos habita in Schola Theologica Universitatis Oxon. 25 Oct. 1626," Oxford, 1627. But Laud has the merit of first establishing a permanent lectureship. Recollecting, probably, the fate of Cardinal Wolsey, he endowed it in the days of his prosperity with lands in the parish of Bray, Bucks. During the absence of Dr. Edward Pococke, the lecture was read by Thomas Greaves, M.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

Few notices now remain to be detailed of this illustrious and martyred Prelate. He was buried in a leaden coffin, in the church of Allhallows, Barking, near the Tower, a church in his own patronage, by his friends, according to the forms of the Church of England, which had then become proscribed, and the use of which amounted to high treason. There did his venerable remains repose till the happy Restoration, when they were removed to a more honorable cemetery in the chapel of his own College. On the 24th of July, 1663, he was interred in a vault under the great altar of St. John's Chapel, on which occasion his funeral oration was pronounced by George Gisbey, B.D., Fellow of St. John's, and Vice-President, in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor, some Heads of Houses, and all the members of the College. On a brass plate against the wainscot, in the south side of the chancel, is the following inscription:

In hac cistula conduntur exuviæ Gul. Laud.
Archiep. Cantuar. qui securi percussus,
Immortalitatem adiit die decimo Jan. anno Dom. 1644-5.
Ætatis autem suæ 72, Archiepiscop. 11.

Qui fui in extremis fortunam expertus utramque
Nemo magis felix et magi nemo miser.
Jam portum inveni, fluctantia secla valete,
Ludite nunc alios, pax erit alta mihi.

Memoriæ Domini sui in Æternum
Honorandi posuit Guil. Dell.
Servus Mœstissimus.

And as in life Laud associated with the illustrious of his age, so in death he now rests with those whom he revered. Under the altar, there are four brick vaults. In one towards the north, are the bones of Sir Thomas Whyte, the illustrious founder of a College which is itself a glorious monument of that Mæcenas of his age. He died 11th February, 1566, aged 72. Adjoining to this are the bones of Laud. On the south side lies the body of his beloved friend and fellow-student, Archbishop Juxon; and adjoining to it, in the fourth vault, is the body of Dr. Richard Baylie, President of the College, who married Elizabeth, daughter of Dr. John Robinson, Archdeacon of Nottingham, and niece of Archbishop Laud. In the Library of the College there is a portrait of the Primate, and another in the Picture Gallery, by Vandyke, in his episcopal habit, with this inscription: "Gul. Laud. Archiep'us Cantuariensis, hujus Academiæ Cancellarius, ab an. 1630, ad resign. 1641. decap. 1645, æt. 72. Ex dono nepotis sui D. Johannis Robinson, Equitis et Ba-

ronnetti, et Turris Regalis Londinensis locum tenen. 1674." It may be remarked, that it was Laud's particular desire to be buried in the Chapel of St. John's; at least, he hoped that, should he die a prisoner, he would not be buried in the Tower[1].

It only remains to notice the contents of the Archbishop's Will, as proved by Dr. Baylie, his executor, on the 8th of January, 1661. It is inserted in the History of his Troubles and Trials, but there is a more complete copy of it in Baker's Collections, (Harleian MSS. 4115.) at the end of which is written by the Collector, "This copy of the Archbishop's Will contains several particulars omitted or abbreviated in the copy printed in the History of the Troubles and Trials of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury." After declaring his religious faith, and that he died a true member of the Protestant Church of England, he bequeaths 800*l.* to the repair of St. Paul's, "if," says he, "it ever go on, while the party trusted with it lives; but my executors are not charged with this; it is safe, and in other hands." To the King he leaves 1000*l.* and he revokes the debt which he owed him of 2000*l.* To St. John's College he leaves all his chapel plate and furniture, his books, and 500*l.* to be expended in the purchase of lands, and the rent of it to be distributed every fourth year, on the 17th of October, among the Fellows and Scholars. "Something else," says he, modestly, "I have done for them already, according to my ability; and God's everlasting bless-

[1] Troubles and Trials, p. 454.

ing be upon that place and that Society for ever." To the Duchess of Buckingham he leaves 100*l.* to the Duke of Buckingham his chalice and patten of gold, which he desires him to accept, as a "memorial of him who had a heart to love, and the honour to be beloved of his father." To his relations he bequeaths as follows:—to Henry Robinson, son to his brother Dr. Robinson, 200*l.*; to his brother, Dr. John Robinson, 200*l.*; to their sister, Lucy, 100*l.*; to their sister, Elizabeth, wife of Dr. Baylie, 100*l.*; to Dr. Cotsford, 100*l.*; to Dr. Edward Layfield, 100*l.*, having already provided well for them; to his niece, Elizabeth Holt, 50*l.*; to his nephew, William Bole, 50*l.*, with a revocation of the debt he owed him; to another niece, 50*l.*; to his chaplains, Dr. Thomas Turner, Dr. Thomas Walker, Dr. Edward Martin, Dr. William Heywood, Dr. John Oliver, Mr. John Alsopp, Mr. George Wilde, and his "ancient friend Mr. Thomas Maye," rings or watches; to the poor of several parishes, with which he had been connected, 5*l.* each; to the poor of Canterbury, Lambeth, and Croydon, 10*l.* each; to twenty-seven servants who were with him at the commencement of his troubles, several sums from 50*l.* to 5*l.*; to an upper servant, Richard Cobb, 50*l.*, with his organ at Croydon, his harp, chest of viols, and the harpsicord at Lambeth. The remainder of his estate he charges his executors to expend on land, on the same conditions as he had settled his property at Bray upon the town of Reading. The several sums of 50*l.* he bestows on the towns of Ockingham,

Henley-upon-Thames, Wallingford, and Windsor; all above 200*l.* he bequeaths to Dr. Baylie, and his family. To his successor in the metropolitan see, he leaves his organ in the chapel at Lambeth, for the use of the Archbishops; his barge and furniture; his pictures in the gallery: but if the see be dissolved they are to be added to his estate. To his servant Cobb, an additional sum of 50*l.*; and to two other servants 10*l.* each; to Dr. Baylie, the charge of his books and papers, and 200*l*, for his trouble as chief executor; he leaves 100*l.* for the purpose of translating his book against Fisher into Latin, that "the Christian world may see and judge of his religion." He makes Bishops Juxon, Curle, Wren, and Duppa, overseers of his Will, with 10*l.* each for their trouble. "Thus," says he, "I forgive all the world, and heartily desire forgiveness of God and the world, and so again commend and commit my soul into the hands of God the Father who gave it, in the merits and mercies of my blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, who redeemed it, and in the peace and comfort of the Holy Ghost, who blessed it; and in the truth and unity of his Holy Catholic Church, and in the communion of the Church of England, as it yet stands established by law."

In concluding the eventful history of this illustrious Primate, I purposely refrain from any lengthened remarks. In it, however, we behold strikingly pourtrayed the mutability of human affairs, and that to those with whom prejudice and habit are inveterate, no limits can be assigned in their thirst for

revenge. From it are most especially manifest the evils of faction, the designs of turbulent men, the strife of revolutionary demagogues, the dreadful consequences of unrestrained enthusiasm and schism. The Puritans seriously believed that the Archbishop was Antichrist; and, like the fabrications of the Church of Rome against Luther, they daringly invented and retailed similar disgusting and fanatical absurdities. But his memory will ever be preserved in the Church of England, as one of its most able and illustrious defenders. To him it is indebted for those admirable laws which distinguish it above every other reformed communion; for the enforcement of those doctrines and rituals which had been pondered with pious care by its venerable and holy martyrs. While the names of his furious and relentless enemies are forgotten, or remembered only with the feelings they deserve for the blood which they shed, that of Laud will not cease to be venerated by every lover of pure and rational religion, by all who revere the institutions of their country, or know how to value the pursuits of learning and science. His lot was cast in days of peril, and worthy he was to have lived in a more enlightened age. His religion was unmixed with superstition; no sectarian feeling characterized his actions; his spirit was as catholic as the religion he professed, and the Church over which he presided. A victim to faction, and murdered by men who scrupled not to consummate their crimes and rebellion by imbruing their hands in the blood of their virtuous sovereign,

his fate demands our compassion, while his heroic and magnanimous end commands our admiration. His death was as glorious as his life had been pious and beneficent; on that awful occasion he rose above himself, and evinced to his enemies how little their hatred could affect his soul. As he himself said of Strafford, his friend and fellow-martyr, 'it is difficult to ascertain whether the Roman or the Christian prevailed;' like St. Cyprian of old, he nobly died for the Church; or, like the holy proto-martyr, he preserved his composure when his enemies stopped their ears against him, and ran upon him gnashing their teeth in fiendish rage. Such is the effect of conscious innocence, of virtue and integrity; of that religion which alone can ensure "a peace which the world cannot give," and which it "cannot take away." Happy, nevertheless, was his end in this, that he died for the Church of England, the reformation of which had not been effected without sacrifices no less melancholy and afflicting; happy, that he beheld not the overthrow of the Church he loved so well, and the misfortunes of a sovereign whom he served with scrupulous fidelity; happy, in conclusion, that he witnessed not the absolute but short-lived triumph of those numerous sectaries who, like locusts, overspread the kingdom; who, by the excitement of their ungovernable fury, spurned the salutary restraints which preserve men in peace and in necessary subjection, as the subjects of order and civil government; the accomplishment of whose daring purposes was marked by a convul-

sion, fearful in its consequences, criminal in its purposes, and sufficiently disastrous, till the reign of fanaticism, hypocrisy, and usurpation was brought to a close.

INDEX.

A.

Abbot, Dr. George, Archbishop of Canterbury, favours the Puritans, i. 33; opposes Laud, ib.; his hatred to Laud, 35; his errors, 37; his conduct towards Laud, 119. 133; succeeds Bancroft in the primacy, 144; mischievous effects of his advancement, 146, 147. 174. 190; notice of his life, 147—150; his flattery, 151; his attachment to Calvinism, 152, 153; abuses Laud from the pulpit, 157, 158; his attempts to ruin Laud, 189—191; his misfortunes, 192; he commits casual homicide, 193; investigation of his case, 195, 196; his pardon, ibid.; opposes Charles' marriage with the Infanta, 240, 241; his harsh treatment of Laud, 247, 248; his letter to the King, ib.; officiates at the coronation of Charles I., 292; is disgraced at court, 368; causes of it, 370; is suspended, ib.; is received into favour, 373; his laxity, 494—496; royal instructions to, 497; his death, ii. 33; his character, ib.

Abbot, Dr. Robert, Bishop of Salisbury, opposes Laud, i. 132, 133; his character, 155; his death, 183.

Aberdeen, its firm adherence to loyalty and Episcopacy, ii. 260.

Abernethy, Bishop Burnet's account of him, ii. 312.

Albigenses, or Waldenses, remarks on, i. 33.

America, Episcopal Church in, i. 64, 65.

Ancient writers, opinions of, on Passive Obedience, i. 353, 354.

Andrews, Dr. L. of Winchester, high reputation of, i. 150; moderation of, 269; death of, 336; his learning, ib.; his works, 337.

Arminius, James, i. 31. 407.

Arminianism, falsely so called, i. 30—32; ignorance of the Puritans on, 401; doctrines of, 403—407; misrepresentations of, 407, 408; more favourable to liberty than Calvinism, 411.

Array, Dr. Henry, opposes Laud, i. 118, 119.

Articles of the Church, remarks on, i. 29—31. 85—88.

Assembly at Glasgow, riotous proceedings of, ii. 316—319.

Augustine, St. i. 28.

B.

Bagshaw, reader of the Middle Temple, his seditious sermon, ii. 347; is silenced by Laud, ib.

Balmerino, Lord, supports Henderson and his associates, ii. 245.

Bancroft, Dr. Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 126; his abilities, 126, 127; death of, 136; character of, 137—141; anecdotes of, 143, 144.

Baptism, doctrine of the Church on, i. 106, 107.

Barlow, Dr., his narrative of the Hampton Court Conference, i. 74. 76.

Barnard, Nathaniel, extravagance of, i. 504.

Bastwick, John, account of, ii. 144, 145; his "Letany," 145—151; his trial, 159; his speech on receiving punishment, 176.

Bellarmine, Cardinal Robert, i. 103—105.

Berengerius, i. 33. 35.

Bigotry, true nature of, i. 510.

Bishops, Scottish, consecration of, at Westminster, i. 172.

———, persecution, and imprisonment of, ii. 424; their office abolished, 433.

Blount, Charles, Earl of Devonshire, i. 91; Story of his marriage, ib.
Bogue and Bennett, remarks on their misstatements, i. 210, 211, *note*.
Boswell, Sir William, letter of, i. 416, 417.
Bradburne, Theophilus, revives the Sabbatarian Controversy, ii. 51.
Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, letter of, i. 418.
Bristol, Earl of, impeaches Buckingham, i. 310.
Buchanan, George. i. 46; ingratitude of, ibid.
Buckeridge, Dr. John, Bishop of Ely, i. 8; notice of him, ib.; his character, 9; Bishop of Rochester, 132.
Buckingham, Duke of, i. 226; notice of him, 228, 229; becomes prime minister to Charles I. 266; impeachment of, 308; account of his collection of pictures, 317, *note;* his expedition to Rochelle, 379, 380; clamours against him, ib.; impeached in the Third Parliament, 394; is assassinated at Portsmouth, 427, 428; his death and character, 433—436.
Burton, Henry, a furious enthusiast, his character, ii. 152; his violent publications, 154, 156; his trial, 159; his speech and behaviour when receiving punishment, 179—181, remarks on his address, 185.

C.

Calvin, his concession respecting rites and ceremonies, i. 88; held the doctrine of a true and real presence in the Eucharist, 322, *note;* his notions concerning Christ's descent into hell, 440; remarks on his ideas of predestination, 401; his declaration respecting Episcopacy, ii. 343, and *note*.
Calvinism, unhappy effects of on the Church of England, i. 14, 15. 22, 23. 26, 27. 29—32; first introduced into Scotland by Andrew Melville, 51; opposition of Laud to, 108, 109, &c.; tenets of, 400, 401, intolerance of, 409; James I., issues directions respecting the preaching of, 215.
Calvinists, Irish, practices of, i. 571.
————, practices of, in 1625, i. 280, 281.
Carleton, Lord Dudley, his account of Buckingham's murder, i. 428—430, *note*.
Cartwright, Thomas, (of Cambridge,) death of, i. 45, 46, *note;* reconciled to the Church, i. 46.
Canons, Book of, for Scotland, injudiciously published before the Liturgy, ii. 204—207, 208. 211.
Canting, origin of the word, ii. 258, and *note*, ib.
Ceremonies of the Church of England, folly of objecting to, i. 83—85. 541; ii. 70.
————, in general, remarks on, i. 539—541; ii. 70, 71.
Chancey, Vicar of Ware, fanaticism of, i. 505.
Chaplains, regulations respecting, i. 503, 504.
Charles I. letter of, i. 228; extraordinary adventure of, in Spain, 231—235; anecdote of, 246; accession of, 265; political feelings in the reign of, 265, &c.; marriage of, 269; thwarted by the Puritans, 283; issues a proclamation against Popish recusants, 284; coronation of, 292, 293; defence of his conduct, 366; speech to his third parliament, 391; court of, 482; character of, ib.; instructs the Scottish Bishops to prepare a Liturgy, ii. 6; proceeds to Scotland, 14; enters Edinburgh, 15; his progress through the kingdom, 28; his dangerous passage from Burntisland, 30; revives the Book of Sports, 53; visits Oxford, 133; his entertainment there, 134; the commencement of his troubles, 140; experiences the first opposition at Stirling, 250; appoints the Marquis of Hamilton his commissioner in Scotland, 293; his transactions with the Covenanters, 294—307; is forced to take up arms against them, 319; treacherous conduct of the Scots in the royal household, ib. and 320; issues an order for a collection of money in aid of his measures against the Scots, 330; calls a Parliament, 350, 351; refractory temper of the Parliament, 351, 352; signs the warrant for the execution of Strafford, 412; returns to London, from Scotland, 422.
Charles II., birth of, i. 511; baptized by Laud, 512.
Chillingworth, William, reclaimed by Laud, 270; account of him, 269—273.
Church, authority of the, i. 15, 16. 85, 86; its constitution, 107—110; Church and State, connection between, valid, i. 484, 485.
———— of England, remarks on, i. 14, 15. 25—27; state of in 1602, ib.; misinter-

pretation of its Articles, i. 29—32; neither Calvinistic nor Arminian, 402, 403. 406.

——— of Scotland, Episcopacy ratified in, i. 54.

Clamour, popular, remarks on, i. 479, 480.

Clergymen, remarks on, as civil rulers, i. 484—486.

Coke, Sir Edward, absurd reasoning of, i. 399.

Committees, religious, appointed by the Parliament, i. 276, 277. 308.

Common Prayer, the Book of, abolished, ii. 495.

Consecration of Churches, remarks on, i. 538—540.

Cooke, Secretary, his speech at the trial of Prynne, ii. 62.

Couper, John, a Scotch Presbyterian, insolence of, i. 169.

Cromwell, Oliver, observation of, i. 472.

Crown, poverty of the, at the accession of Charles I., i. 279—281.

D.

Dale, Christopher, of Merton College, i. 91.

Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, Sermon of, i. 513; is summoned before the Privy Council, 514.

Davis, Lady, anecdote of, ii. 100. *note.*

Deering, Sir Edward, his observation on Laud's Conference with Fisher the Jesuit, i. 226; and on his repairs of St. Paul's, 561; his invectives against Laud, ii. 377.

Digby, Sir Kenelm, MSS. given by him to the University of Oxford, ii. 114.

Divorce, opinions on the law of, i. 114.

Dissenters, errors of respecting ordination, i. 38, 39.

Dickson, the associate of Alexander Henderson, ii. 16.

Dort, Synod of, meeting of, i. 184. 259. *note.* 411.

Downham, Dr., Bishop of Derry, his treatise on the Perseverance of the Saints suppressed by royal proclamation, i. 571.

Duppa, Dr. Bryan, Dean of Christ Church, extract from his letter to Laud, i. 565.

Du Moulin, Lewis, animadversions on his censure of Laud, ii. 522.

E.

Edinburgh erected into an episcopal see, ii. 24; extent of the diocese, 26; extraordinary tumult there, at the first reading of the Liturgy, 217—224.

Edward's, Gangræna, ii. 288. 440.

Election, unconditional, remarks on the doctrine of, i. 212, 13; James I. issues directions respecting the preaching of, 215, 216.

Elector of Saxony, difficulties of, i. 192. 202. 230.

Elizabeth, Queen, death of, i. 40; character of, i. 41, 42.

Elliot, Sir John, violence of, i. 471; punishment of, 476, 477.

England, New, emigration of discontented enthusiasts thither, ii. 141. 288.

Enthusiasm, its mischievous tendency, i. 264. 292. 500. ii. 321-2.

Episcopal Church of Scotland, remarks on it, i. 65—7; the ancient and legitimate Church of that nation, 200; depressed state of its clergy, 200—1. 262.

Episcopacy, observations of Dissenters upon, i. 64; refutation of them, 65; abolished, ii. 433.

Erastian tenet respecting Church government rejected by the later Presbyterians, i. 60.

Evangelism, modern, i. 128.

Evelyn, John, his testimony in favour of Laud, ii. 531.

Eucharist, doctrine of, i. 322, 323.

Extemporaneous prayer, ii. 233.

Extravagance, religious, carried too far, i. 290, 291.

F.

Felton, John, a fanatic, assassinates the Duke of Buckingham, i. 427, 428; his reasons for it, 431, 432; trial and execution, 441—445.

Finch, Lord Keeper, impeachment of, ii. 378; and escape, ibid.

Fisher, John, the Jesuit, i. 217; his disputation with Laud, 218, 219; account of the publication of the Conference, ii. 533, *note.*

Forbes, Dr. William, first Bishop of Edinburgh, ii. 26.

Foreign congregations in England, orders respecting, i. 583; history of, 586—592.

France, war with, i. 378. 381.

Fuller, Thomas, his remarks on Laud's Diary, ii. 515.

G.

Gage, Thomas, anecdote of, concerning Laud, ii. 522.
Geddes, Janet, her concern in the tumult at Edinburgh, in the case of the Liturgy, ii. 218.
Geneva, polity of, i. 14; spread of the tenets of, i. 22; effects of, i. 23, 24.
Glasgow, tumultuous assembly of the Covenanters there, ii. 316.
Goodman, Dr. sermon of, i. 320; his opinions, 321, 322; anecdote of 323.
Grimston, Harbottle, his speech against Laud, ii. 386.
Grotius, (quoted) i. 354. 357, 358. 361, &c.; his message to Laud, ii. 489.

H.

Hales, John, the "ever memorable," reclaimed by Laud, ii. 275; account of him, 275—281.
Hall, Dr. Bishop of Norwich, letter from to Laud, i. 120, 121; writes his treatise on Episcopacy by Laud's recommendation, ii. 334; replies to it, under the title of Smectymnus, 345.
Hamburgh, members of the factory there, embrace Calvinism, i. 583; regulations respecting them, ibid. and 585—589, 590.
Hamilton, Marquis of, character of, i. 488; notice of, ib.; appointed commissioner in Scotland, ii. 293; his transactions with the Covenanters, 293.
Hammond, Dr. Henry, quoted, i. 451, 452.
Hampden, John, his opposition to the Court, ii. 375; his death, 449; his character, 450.
Hampton Court Conference, i. 72, 73; its effects, 73, 74; conduct of the Puritans at, 75, 76. 85—89.
Harsnet, Archbishop of York, i. 514.
Henderson, Alexander, his plot for the defeat of the Liturgy, ii. 216; his character, ib.; his intrigues against the Church, 245; is defeated at Aberdeen, 260; he excites a tumult at Glasgow, 317—319.
Henrietta Maria, of France, marriage of, i. 270; her arrival in England, ib. character of, 483, 484.
Henry, Prince of Wales, death of, i. 124.
Heylin, Dr. Peter, anecdote of, concerning Laud, i. 4, 5. *note*, 389; attacks the impropriations, 551; his anecdote of Lady Davies, ii. 100, *note*; and of Laud, 348.
Hill, Thomas, seditious sermon of, i. 563, 564.
Holland, the great resort of the Puritans, ii. 284.
Holland, Dr. John, of Exeter College, conduct of, i. 18; his character, 108, *note*; his death, 155.
Holles, Denzil, fined, i. 477.
Hugonots, French, assisted by Charles I. i. 377.
Hume, remarks of, on the ceremonies of the Church, i. 542; and on the Long Parliament, ii. 374; his character of the Earl of Strafford's judges, 410. 412.
Humphries, Dr. Lawrence, Puritanical opinions of, i. 16; notice of his life, 17, 18.
Huss, John, i. 34.

I.

Impropriations, history of, i. 549—554.
Incendiaries, practices of, i. 351, 352.
Independents, observations on them, ii. 437.
Ireland, state of, in the time of Laud, ii. 93.

J.

James I. accession of, i. 43; state of parties at, 44—46; the Church of England, 47; the Puritans, ib.; the Papists, ib.; proceedings at his accession, 49, 50; slanders of the Puritans against, 56—61; remarks on his conduct, 61—65; his remarks on religion, in his speech to his first Parliament, 92; his visit to Scotland, 173; his return, 183; political errors of, 184, 185; his difficulties, 202—205; death of, 252; his character, 252—262.
Jesuits, proclamations against, i. 284, 285.
Jesuit, opinions of one, on Puritanism, i. 413—416.
Jewish Scriptures, historical examples of, not applicable to modern times, i. 348, 349; erroneous notions on, ib.
Jones, an enthusiast, conduct of, i. 437, 438.
Juxon, Dr. William, promoted, i. 574; advanced to the see of London, ii. 35; appointed Lord Treasurer, 123; his character, 125.

K.

KNIGHT, seditious sermon of, at Oxford, i. 209; is reproved, 210.
KNOX, John, his opinions on church government, i. 51, and *note*, ib. and 52, 53; and on the English Liturgy, 587, 588; his remarks on the rapacity of the Scottish nobles, in seizing the revenues of the Church, ii. 208. *note*.

L.

LAKE, Dr. Arthur, Bishop of Bath and Wells, death of, i. 328.
Lamb, Sir John, i. 339, 340.
Lamb, Dr. assassinated at London, i. 443.
Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, birth of, i. 1; family and connections, 2—7; juvenile years, 8; sent to St. John's College, Oxford, ib.; obtains a Scholarship, 9; proceeds in his degrees in arts, ib.; conduct at the University, 10, 11; takes Holy Orders, 11, 12; reads the Divinity Lectures of Mrs. Maye's foundation, 28; his opinions, 32; refutes Archbishop Abbot, 37; is chosen Proctor for the University, 70; Chaplain to the Earl of Devonshire, 91; proceeds B.D. 102; disputes at Oxford, 102, 103; is attacked by the Puritans, 103; opinions of Laud, 105, 106; he celebrates the marriage of Lord Devonshire, 111; history of that transaction, 111—116; his repentance, 116, 117; prayers on, ib.; slanders of his enemies, 117; is persecuted by the Oxford Puritans, 118; his preferments, 130; his generosity, 131; President of St. John's, 133, 134, 135; proceedings at the election, ib.; is Dean of Gloucester, 154; he preaches before the University, 156; clamours of the Puritans, ib.; abused by Dr. Robert Abbot, 157, 158; he reforms Gloucester Cathedral, 140; and the University of Oxford, 162; he accompanies James I. to Scotland, 175; his return, 183; clamours against him, 185; is Prebendary of Westminster, 186; Bishop of St. David's, 188; resigns the Presidency of St. John's, 198; his Primary Visitation, 207, 208; his dispute with Fisher the Jesuit, 218; he publishes an account of it, 219: extracts from it, 219—226; he is recommended to the Duke of Buckingham, 227; he becomes chaplain to that nobleman, 229; corresponds with Buckingham while in Spain, 237, 238; insinuations of his enemies, ib.; breach between Laud and Williams, 245, 246; appointed to preach before Charles I. 267; slanders against him, 268; his sermons, 270; officiates at the coronation of Charles I. 287; his care of the regalia, 289; accused of altering the coronation oath, 293—305; clamours against him, 303—316; is removed to Bath and Wells, 328; manages the subsidies for the King, 329—331; imprudence of, 332; is made a Privy Councillor, 381; anecdote of, 389, 390; persecuted by the Parliament, 397—399; is removed to the See of London, 421; his munificence at Oxford, 445, 446; his presents to the University, 447, 448; theological opinions of, 466, 467; libels against, 478; is chosen Chancellor of Oxford, 508; his patronage of literature, 510, 511; defence of Laud in Leighton's case, 534—537; consecrates St. Catherine Cree Church, ib.; his magnificent plans, 545, 546; opposes the Impropriations, 553, 554; enlarges St. John's College, Oxford, 555; repairs St. Paul's, 558—560; his government of Oxford, 562, 563; his care of the Church, 573—575; prosecutes the King's printers, 575, 576; his advice to Dr. Maxwell respecting a Liturgy for Scotland, ii. 6; accused of causing it to be imposed upon the people, 7, 8; preaches before Charles I. at Holyrood Chapel, 23; appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, 35; a cardinal's hat offered to him, 36; elected Chancellor of the University of Dublin, 45; regulations respecting candidates for ordination, 46; charged with causing the revival of the Book of Sports, 55; concerned in the trial of Prynne, 57; who writes a libellous letter against him, 67; commences his first metropolitan visitation, 68; his regulations with respect to the Communion Table, 69; suspends Bishop Williams for contumacy, 73; his regulations respecting the French and Dutch congregations, 77. 80—82; threatened by the Puritans, 83, 84; regulates and improves the revenues of the London clergy, 88. 91; and lectureships, ib.; his services to the Irish Church, 92—5; his letters to Wentworth, 94; obtains a new charter for the University of Dublin, 98; anecdote of Lady Davies, 100, *note*; Irish impropriations, 104; appointed Member of the Committee of

Trade, and a Commissioner of the Treasury, 106; and of the Foreign Committee, 107; takes cognizance of the Cathedral Churches, 110; procures valuable MSS. for the University of Oxford, 114; and a large charter, 116; his interview with the Queen, 118; Mission of Pansani from the Pope, ib.; promotes a collection from the clergy for the Palatinate, 120; causes Juxon to be appointed to the office of Lord Treasurer, 123; claims the right of visiting the Universities, 129; proceeds to visit Oxford, where he entertains the King and Queen, 133; his speech after the trial of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton, 161—8; various libels against him, 186, 187; his speech at the trial of Bishop Williams, 194; speech on the increase of Popery, 197; unjustly charged with the framing of the Scottish Liturgy and Canons, 207; writes to the Earl of Traquair respecting the tumult in Edinburgh, 255; takes cognizance of the islands of Jersey and Guernsey, 267; reclaims Chillingworth, 269—273; and John Hales, 275; his efforts against Socinianism, 282; his exertions to collect money for the war against the Scots, 330, 331; is reconciled to the Queen, 332; urges Hall, Bishop of Exeter, to write his treatise in Defence of Episcopacy, 334; his comments on it, 337—339; his expostulation with Graham, Bishop of Orkney, 339; perceives plain indications of his approaching misfortunes, 351; is accused of neglecting to dissolve the Convocation, 358, 359; and of causing the dissolution of the Parliament, 363; his palace at Lambeth attacked, 364; anecdote respecting his picture, 369; is examined in Strafford's case, 379; enquiry respecting his concerns in the Canons, 381; charge against him, 383; proceedings against him, 384; case of the Lady of Sir John Villiers, 391; his speech on his impeachment, 395—400; is committed to the Tower, 402; his demeanour at the execution of Strafford, 413, 414; sends his resignation to the University of Oxford, 417; his jurisdiction sequestrated by the House of Peers, 419; his sufferings and privations while in prison, 427—432; his sufferings owing to the Scottish Covenanters, 435, 436; his trial, 456; analysis and examination of the charges against him, 460; his reply to the charge that he endeavoured to reconcile the Churches of England and Rome, 476; conclusion of the trial, 482; his reflections on the attempt to escape, suggested to him by Grotius, 490; his sentence, 497; his dying address and execution, 499—508; reflections, 509; remark on his Diary, 516; his character, 515—518; advances several learned men, 519; vindication of his character, 529; account of his publications and benefactions, 532; his burial, 539; epitaph, 540; his will, 541—543; brief review of his character, 544.

Lecturers, regulations respecting them, i. 497; three classes of them, 501, ii. 89.

Lecturers, Puritan, practices of, i. 552, 553.

Leighton, Dr., story of, i. 515, &c.; sedition of, 516; prosecution of, 518; sentence of, ib.; escapes from prison, 521; is retaken, ib.; punishment, ib.

Lilburne, John, his seditious publications, and punishment, ii. 188-9; excites a tumult against Laud, 364.

Lindsay, Dr. Patrick, Archbishop of Glasgow, conduct of, at the coronation of Charles I. in Scotland, ii. 17.

Liturgy, revision of, at the Hampton Court Conference, i. 73; a liturgy no essential requisite of episcopacy, ii. 4; necessity of, ibid.; singular fact concerning its adoption by the Scots in the reign of Elizabeth, ibid.

Liturgy, proclamations on, i. 76, 77, 78.

London, bishopric of, its importance, i. 382, 383.

London, Lord Mayor of, and Aldermen, fined, i. 443.

Long Parliament, account of, ii. 373; they deprive the Bishops of the power of voting in the case of the Earl of Strafford, 380.

M.

Magazine, Scottish Episcopal, quoted, i. 419, 420. 422, 423.

Mainwaring, Dr. Roger, his sermons, 344; erroneous notions of, 345; censure of, ib.; punished by the parliament, 395.

Matthews, Dr. Toby, Archbishop of York, death of, i. 385, *note;* his diligence, 386; his character, ib.

Maxwell, Dr. John, Bishop of Ross, referred to Laud by Charles I. respecting a Liturgy for Scotland, ii. 6.

Melville, Andrew, introduces Calvinism into Scotland, &c. i. 51—54; violence

of, 129; his insolence to Archbishop Bancroft, 171; epigram of, ib.; his banishment, 172; his crafty regulations of the General Assembly, 308.
Millenary Petition, i. 48—69; opposed by the Universities, 70; cunning practices of the petitioners, 71, 72.
Montague, Dr. Richard, opposes the Papists, i. 250; is persecuted by the Parliament, 276, 279, 307; is consecrated to Chichester, 437.
Montaigne, Dr., Bishop of London, i. 367; is removed to Durham, 385; to York, 387; death of, ib.
Morton, the Regent, establishes Episcopacy in Scotland, i. 54.

N.

Neal, the Puritan historian, misrepresentations of, i. 54—57; inconsistencies of, 71—83; 374, *note;* 378, *note;* 460, *note.*
Neile, Dr., Archbishop of York, his friendship to Laud, i. 154. 381; persecuted by the Parliament, 397—399; translated from Winchester to York, 574; his death, ii. 371.
Non-resistance, authorities from the heathen writers of antiquity in support of it, i. 353-4; and from the Scriptures, 359—363.
Noy, Attorney-General, his speech against Prynne, ii. 61.

O.

Oath, Coronation, of Charles I. i. 295; of Edward II., 296; proved not to have been altered by Laud, 297—305.
Ordination, errors of Dissenters on, i. 38, 39, 40; importance of valid, ib.
Oxford, University of, directions for the government of, i. 162, 163; brief summary of Laud's benefactions to it, ii. 538.

P.

Palatine, the Elector, distresses of, i. 230.
Panzani, his mission from the Pope, ii. 118.
Papists, practices of, i. 217, 218; insolence of, 248, 249.
Parliament, first, of King James, i. 92; speech of James at, 92, 93; meeting of, in 1624, 247.
Parliament, first, of Charles I., i. 270; conduct of, 275—279; censure of, 279, 281; hypocrisy of, 281.
Parliament, second, of Charles I., meeting of, i. 806; dissolution of, 312, 313.
Parliament, third, of Charles I., meeting of, 390; speech of the King to, 391, 392; conduct of, 394—399; prorogation of, 420; meeting of, 455; protest of, 459; observations of Laud on, 462—464; debates of, 473, 474; breach between the King and, 474, 475; disorders of, 476; dissolution of, 477.
Parliament, Scottish, meeting of, i. 177; punishment of the Presbyterians by, ibid.
Passive Obedience, discussion on, i. 351—362; ignorant charge against the Episcopal clergy for preaching, 363—366.
Perth, Articles of, i. 178; General Assembly at, 180; ratification of the Articles of, 181, 182.
Pococke, Dr. Edward, appointed professor of Arabic at Oxford, by Laud, ii. 489; anecdote of him, ibid.
Pole, Cardinal, i. 95.
Popular elections of ministers, mischievous effects of, ii. 89.
Potter, Dr., a violent Calvinist, promoted, i. 453.
Preachers, seditious, silenced, i. 501, 502; restored by Abbot, ib.; extravagance of, 505, 506; expelled from Oxford, i. 547.
Preaching, regulations concerning, i. 215, 216; of secondary importance, 498—501; ii. 50.
Predestination. See Calvinism. Fallacy of that doctrine, 212, 213. 404, 405; Royal Declaration against, 448; fanaticism of the Puritans for, 449.
Presbyterians, their treatment of James I. i. 59; their insolence to him, 169, 170, 171; their corrupt interpretation of a Scripture passage, 350; their hostility to the Episcopal Church, and their efforts to excite the Scots against the Articles of Perth, ii. 2, 3; arrogance of, 19; character of their preachers in the days of Charles, i. 20; their secret designs for the defeat of the Liturgy, 211; narrative of the tumult excited by them on the occasion of introducing the Liturgy, 217—224; their unfounded objections to forms of prayer, 234; their riotous proceedings, 245—260; their pernicious tenets respecting ecclesiastical power, 314-15; their intolerant spirit, 437; their furious ordinance against cathedrals, altars, pictures, &c. 443.

Presbyterianism unknown in the Church till Calvin's time, ii. 200; its intolerant spirit, 437.
Primitive Christians on Passive Obedience, i. 359, 360; modern writers on, 360, 361.
Private interpretation, remarks on, i. 62; denounced, 365.
Public opinion, unknown in the ancient republics, i. 355.
Puritans, their practices, i. 10. 13, 14. 19. 44. 57, 58. 70, 71. 107, 108. 163-4. 201. 207; their errors respecting church government, 88. 141; effects of their opinions at Oxford, 212; mischievous effects of their tenets, 264. 292; difference between them and Papists, with respect to ceremonies, 540; Holland, their great resort, ii. 284; their extravagant notions, ib.; anecdote of, 350.
Prynne, William, abuses Laud, i. 236. 314. 441, *note;* 462. 508, *note;* attacks Dr. Montague, 324—326; notice of his life, 577; his works, 578; his Histrio-Mastyx, 580—582; imprisonment of, ib.; ludicrous epitaph upon, ii. 57, *note;* his Histrio-Mastyx, ib.; character of the work, 58-9; is brought before the Star-Chamber, 60; Noy's speech against him, 61; his sentence, 63; punishment, 64; remarks on it, 65; writes a libellous letter to Laud, 67; publishes several abusive works, 142; for which he is indicted, 144; his trial, 159; his speech and behaviour when receiving punishment, 177-8; his poetical effusion after his punishment, 181, *note;* recalled from exile, and enters London in triumph, with Burton and Bastwick, 379; his unfeeling treatment of Archbishop Laud, 453.
Pym, William, his speech in the Committee for Religion, ii. 376; his death, 449; his character, 450.

R.

Regeneration, baptismal, the doctrine of, asserted, i. 105—107.
Reynolds, Dr. John, i. 20; character of, i. 21, 22.
Rhé, Isle of, unfortunate expedition against, i. 379.
Rich, Lady, story of, i. 111—113.
Richardson, Chief Justice, his extravagant zeal against popular amusements, ii. 52.
Rome, the Church of, a corrupt but true Church, ii. 38, 39.
Rouse, Francis, fanatical speech of, i. 457, 458.
Rutherford, Samuel, letters of, ii. 237, *note;* slanders Archbishop Spottiswoode, 316, *note;* extracts from his "Lex Rex," 315.

S.

Sabbatarian controversy, ii. 51.
Sabbath, importance of, i. 257, 258; Puritan errors on, ib.
Scotland, present Episcopal Church of, i. 65—67.
Scotland, visit of James I. to, i. 165; state of the country, 166—168; union of, with England, abandoned, 168.
Scots, their high military renown, ii. 12; rebellion, 349.
Scottish Bishops, averse to the English Liturgy, ii. 7.
Scottish Commissioners, their proceedings against Laud, ii. 382.
Scottish Covenanters, ii. 291—312; call in the assistance of a "prophetess," named Mitchelson, 313; their tumultuous Assembly at Glasgow, 316-17; their enmity to Strafford, 377; licentiousness of the lives of some of them, 420; their violent proceedings, 434.
Scottish Episcopal Church, state of, at the accession of Charles I. ii. 2.
Scottish Liturgy, injudiciously published after the Book of Canons, ii. 204—11; secret designs of the Presbyterians to defeat it, 211; is revised by Laud, Juxon, and Wren, 212; unhappy mismanagement respecting it, 213-14; narrative of the unsuccessful attempt to introduce it in Edinburgh, 217.
Sermons, popular, errors of, i. 498.
Sherfield, Henry, prosecution of, i. 570.
Sibthorpe, Dr. Robert, preaches against the Puritans, i. 338, 339; publishes his sermons, 366, 367.
Sixtus V., anecdote of, i. 5.
Smith, Dr. Miles, his character and conduct, i. 160-1.
Smith, Richard, Popish Bishop of Chalcedon, interdicted, i. 453.
Solemn League and Covenant, origin of, ii. 252; remarks on, 255.
Spain, negotiations with, i. 230.
Sports, Book of, establishment of, 257; censure of, ib.; object of, ii. 52. 136-7.
Spottiswoode, Archbishop of St. Andrew's, spirited conduct of, i. 180; appointed Lord Chancellor of Scotland, by Charles

I., ii. 27; exposed to great danger during the tumult at Edinburgh, on the occasion of introducing the Liturgy, 219; withdraws to London, 326; death of, ib.; his character, 326-7.
Star Chamber, and High Commission Courts, abolished, ii. 424.
Strafford, Earl of. *See* WENTWORTH; his impeachment, ii. 377; his committal, 379; his trial, 409; Hume's character of his judges, 410; his execution, 413; his character, 415.
St. John's College, Oxford, description of, i. 555—558.
St. Paul's, repairing of, i. 558, 559.
Superintendent system established in Scotland by the Scottish Reformers, i. 53.
Symmons, Dr. Charles, censure of, i. 523—529.

T.

"TABLES," the Scottish enthusiasts divided into classes, so called, ii. 251.
Tours, Council of, condemns the creed of the Waldenses, i. 33; remark of Mr. Hume on its proceedings, ib. *note*.
Traquair, Earl of, secretly abets the schemes of the Presbyterians against the Liturgy, ii. 213—215.
True religion, nature of, i. 500.

U.

UNIVERSITIES, Scottish, vanity of, i. 174.
Usher, Archbishop, favours predestination, i. 569, 570; ii. 102; prefers the Lambeth Articles to the Thirty-nine Articles, ibid.

V.

VISIBILITY of the Church, Archbishop Abbot's fanciful theory of the, i. 32, 33, 34; its errors, i. 35—37; opinions of Laud on, i. 40.

W.

WALDENSES, i. 33. 36.
Walsingham, Sir Francis, conduct of, i. 19, 20; censure of, ibid.
Welsh, John, Presbyterian minister, anecdote of, i. 170.
Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, i. 455; character of, 489, 490. 493; is made Lord Deputy of Ireland, 572.
Weston, Sir Richard, i. 455.
Westminster, bishopric of, i. 382; is dissolved, 383.
Whiston, Vicar of Bethenden, testimony of, concerning Laud, ii. 532.
White, Dr. Francis, his disputes with the Papists, i. 224.
Whitgift, Archbishop, i. 47; prayer of, i. 48, *note;* his death, i. 93; notice of his life, 94—98; his character, 100—102; anecdote of, ibid.
Whitgift, Robert, Abbot of Wellow, i. 94.
Whyte, Sir Thomas, founder of St. John's, i. 11.
Wickliffe, i. 33.
Williams, Dr., Bishop of Lincoln, selfishness of, i. 187, 188; his ambition, 195; his hatred to Laud, 245; is disgraced at court, 284; encourages the Puritans, 339; is prosecuted in the Star Chamber, 341; opposes Laud, ii. 72; is suspended for contumacy, 73; favours the Puritans, 74; prosecution against him, 189; his character and conduct, 189—193; his trial, 193—5, and sentence, 195; released from the Tower, 379; advises Charles I. to sign the warrant for the execution of Strafford, 412; causes the sequestration of Laud's jurisdiction, 419.
Windebanke, Secretary, his impeachment, ii. 378, and escape, ibid.
Wood, Antony, his observations on Laud's Diary, ii. 486.
Wren, Dr., Bishop of Norwich, ii. 137; his character, 205.

Y.

Young, Dr., Bishop of Rochester, his prognostications of Laud, i. 13.

Z.

Zuinglius, i. 16.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY R. GILBERT, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

DATE DUE

AUG 06 2008

[redacted]

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
BX5199.L28 L3
Lawson, John Parker/The life and times o
G
3 2400 00061 6957

48868

BX
5199
L28
L3
v.2

Life and times of Wm. Laud
/ J.P. Lawson

DATE	ISSUED TO
	CBBD
APR 2 0 1987	Wadkins 6101457
JUN 3 1987	RENEWED
SEP 2 3 1987	RENEWED
JAN 1 9 1988	RENEWED MAY 3 1 1988

GAYLORD 4

48868

BX
5199
L28L3
v.2